

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXV.

BALTIMORE, JUNE, 1910.

No. 6.

## A WORLD CENSUS OF INCUNABULA.

When the art of printing was invented towards the middle of the fifteenth century a profound impression of the importance of the discovery was quickly made upon the general public, and in the course of a few score years presses had been established in almost every country of Europe. The early printers seem to have worked with surprising zeal and rapidity, and the result was an enormous number of editions published in many different places before the close of the century.

But with the passing of time people inevitably lost interest in these early productions of the press, and they in consequence soon fell into almost complete oblivion. It was therefore not until several centuries had elapsed that any one began to think the earliest printed books worthy of serious attention. By degrees the book collectors and bibliographers became interested in the older literature in printed form, and thenceforth early books came more and more into public favor in educated circles.

During the whole of the eighteenth century the efforts at cataloguing old books were rather desultory, and no very sharp distinctions were drawn between them and other literary curiosities. After a time, however, both librarians and bibliographers began to consider fifteenth century books as a separate and distinct portion of a large library. A movement arose in consequence which was designed to gather such books together under the name of incunabula, and to consider them as next in importance to the Mediaeval and Classical manuscripts.

Bibliographers now set to work in earnest to describe and catalogue such incunabula as they were able to find, and this new departure in the book world has continued to meet with such favor that at the present time many enterprises of this sort are under way.

It would seem, therefore, to be an opportune

moment for the taking of a preliminary World Census of Incunabula in order to make our ideas as to the extent and importance of this sort of literature more definite and precise.

In the taking of a census various kinds of information may be taken into account. In the present instance we may limit the inquiry to the following questions :

1. How many editions were published ?
2. How many copies are extant ?

It should, of course, be stated at the outset that a definite answer to either of these questions is entirely impossible. The most that can be hoped for is a reasonably plausible estimate based upon such pertinent facts as may be ascertainable at the present time. The answer to the second question, it may be remarked, is much the harder of the two owing to a general lack of sufficient data.

### 1. Editions Published.

The first task which incunabulum bibliographers have commonly set themselves has been the drawing up of a list of all the editions published in the fifteenth century. It has been customary to limit such an investigation oftentimes to a town or country, but Ludwig Hain appears to have been the first bibliographer to undertake such an enumeration for all the countries of Europe.

His world-famous *Repertorium Bibliographicum* was published between the years 1826 and 1838, but the author did not live to complete his great undertaking, and the last volume was published two years after his death from his unfinished manuscript. This bibliography lists 16,311 editions, and it was based chiefly on the large collection of incunabula in the Staatsbibliothek at München. If the author had been asked to estimate the entire number of editions published in the fifteenth century it seems likely that he would not have placed the figure above 20,000 ; but we shall see presently how both the actual figures and the estimates have kept steadily rising as time went on.

Dr. Copinger in his *Supplement to Hain* pub-

lished from 1895 to 1902 added 6832 titles, and thus brought the total number up to 23,143. Since 1902 Dr. Reichling has published four *Appendices* describing 1427 further editions, and bringing the total up to 24,570.<sup>1</sup>

In 1904 the Prussian government appointed a Kommission für den Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke, and at the outset it was estimated that there were 30,000 fifteenth century editions.<sup>2</sup>

In 1908 Mr. G. K. Fortescue, Keeper of Printed Books in the British Museum, in speaking of the matter said: "It is by no means improbable that the total number extant may be about thirty thousand."<sup>3</sup>

Likewise in 1908 Mr. R. A. Peddie of St. Bride Foundation, London, began the publication of a new conspectus, which he estimates will contain about 30,000 entries.<sup>4</sup> The letters A-B have been completed and contain 7128 entries (without addenda). Now as Hain has 4186 for A-B (without addenda), and Copinger adds 1397 (without addenda), it follows that at the same rate Mr. Peddie's bibliography will have 29,547 entries (without addenda).

To arrive at a proper estimate of the entire number of editions there must still be made a certain allowance for omissions. A great many libraries the world over have not yet been thoroughly searched for incunabula, and it is likely that they contain quite a number of editions not known to the bibliographers mentioned above. Then, too, it is quite probable that some of the fifteenth century editions have completely disappeared by this time, if we are to judge from the rather large number of apparently unique copies of incunabula that are now on record. Further

search will doubtless show some of these to be extant in more than one copy, yet all of these cases will certainly never result thus; and in the other direction a similar state of affairs must exist.

The various special bibliographies now in course of publication will keep on adding new titles to the general lists, and we will probably not be far from the truth in estimating the total number of editions published in the fifteenth century to have been 35,000.

## 2. Copies Extant.

In attempting to estimate the number of copies of incunabula extant in all the libraries of the world we are at once confronted by the fact that in a large majority of the libraries probably the incunabula have never been counted. To give an idea of the number of libraries containing incunabula it may be stated that Germany, Austria, Italy and France together have considerably over a thousand such libraries, without reckoning the rest of the world.

In taking a census we are thus forced to avail ourselves of a series of estimates with which to supplement the actual counts of incunabula in certain libraries. In the following attempt at a census the counts and estimates will most conveniently be grouped by countries in accordance with the usual kind of information that is at present available. The various countries will be taken up in the decreasing order of the number of copies which they probably contain.

### a. Germany.

Information concerning the number of incunabula in German libraries has been available to a certain extent for a long time past. To go no further back than the year 1875, we find in the fifth edition of Dr. Julius Petzholdt's *Adressbuch der Bibliotheken Deutschlands*<sup>5</sup> statistics given which indicate the presence of 36,190 copies in but 23 libraries whose contents were estimated in round numbers.

In 1893 Dr. Paul Schwenke published a more

<sup>1</sup> For these statistics see R. A. Peddie, *Fifteenth Century Books: An Author Index*, in *The Library World*, N. S., Vol. XI (1908), p. 43. Nos. 5 and 6 (1910) not included.

<sup>2</sup> Direktor Prof. Dr. Häbler, *Der Incunabelkatalog der Bibliotheken Deutschlands*, in *Mitteilungen des Oesterr. Vereins für Bibliothekswesen*, Vol. XIII (1909), pp. 74-87. See p. 76.

<sup>3</sup> See prefatory note to the *Catalogue of Books printed in the XVth Century now in the British Museum*, Part I. London: 1908.

<sup>4</sup> The following is an extract from a personal letter dated Mar. 30, 1910: "I estimate that my work will contain about 30,000 entries. The first volume which will be out in a few days contains A-B with 7128 entries."

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Julius Petzholdt, *Adressbuch der Bibliotheken Deutschlands mit Einschluss von Oesterreich-Ungarn und der Schweiz*, neu herausgegeben von —. Dresden: G. Schönfeld's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1875. 8vo., xii and 526 pp.

complete *Adressbuch*<sup>6</sup> for the libraries of Germany, and in this statistics are given for 374 libraries with 113,860 copies. These figures are partly due to actual counts, and partly to estimates, but there were besides a large number of libraries that were cited indefinitely in the matter of incunabula.

Dr. Häbler states in the article previously cited that the Prussian commission originally estimated that the public libraries of Germany contained about 100,000 copies, but that after several years of work in this field they were obliged to raise their estimate to 120,000 copies. Up to April 1, 1909, the commission had inventoried 347 libraries containing about 60,000 copies.

In a personal letter to the author of the present article dated April 7, 1910, Dr. Häbler reaffirms this estimate of 120,000 copies for the public libraries, to which he would add 12,000 copies for the private libraries of Germany.<sup>7</sup>

But as we must recognize the practical impossibility of attaining to a complete enumeration, especially in the case of private libraries, it would seem reasonable to place the total figure for Germany at 140,000 copies, by far the largest for any country in the world.

The latest edition of Trübner's *Minerva*<sup>8</sup> gives

<sup>6</sup>Dr. Paul Schwenke, *Adressbuch der Deutschen Bibliotheken*, bearbeitet von —. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz 1893. 8vo., iv, xx and 411 pp. (Zehntes Beiheft zum *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*.)

<sup>7</sup>Kommission für den Gesamtkatalog  
der Wiegendrucke, Berlin W. 64,  
Behrenstr. 40, d. 7. April 1910.

SEHR GEEHRTER HERR!

Bei Begründung der Kommission für den Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke hatte man angenommen, dass es in Deutschland, ausser im Besitz von Privatpersonen, etwa 100,000 Exemplare von Inkunabeln gäbe. Die Inventarisierungsarbeiten, die jetzt ihrem Ende nahe sind, haben aber gezeigt, dass es in Wirklichkeit etwa 120,000 Exemplare sein werden. Wie viel man für privat Sammlungen dazu rechnen darf, ist schwer zu schätzen. 10,000 wird zu niedrig, 20,000 entschieden zu hoch gerechnet sein. Ich schätze annähernd 12,000; also Summa 132,000.

Zu weiterer Auskunft gern bereit . . . bin ich  
Ihr sehr ergebener

K. HAEBLER.

<sup>8</sup>Dr. K. Trübner, *Minerva: Jahrbuch der Gelehrten Welt*, begründet von —. Neunzehnter Jahrgang, 1909-1910.

a total of 65,943 copies for German libraries, but only some 52 of the larger collections are listed.

#### b. Italy.

Italy was the second home of the art of printing in the fifteenth century, and hence it is not surprising to find a very large number of incunabula still preserved in its libraries.

In the years 1893-1896 the Italian government published a detailed *Statistica delle Biblioteche*,<sup>9</sup> which lists the collections of incunabula in 247 libraries with a total of 64,337 copies. To this figure should be added the collection in the Vatican Library numbering about 2500 copies,<sup>10</sup> and perhaps those of other church libraries not investigated by the government officials. Allowing for some omissions we would have the number 75,000 for the public libraries, and with perhaps 15,000 for private libraries not included above, we would have the final figure of 90,000 copies for all the libraries of Italy.

Trübner's *Minerva* gives 35,297 copies for only 43 libraries.

#### c. Austria.

Austria occupies the peculiar position in the library world of having still preserved its old monastic libraries largely intact, and it is quite possible that the official statistics are on that account not as complete as they are for the other countries near by.

Already in 1875 Dr. Petzholdt listed in his previously cited work 75 libraries in Austria with collections of incunabula totaling 36,285 copies. In the fuller catalogue of Austrian libraries published by Drs. Johann Bohatta and Michael Holzmänn in 1900<sup>11</sup> this total has been raised to 53,134

Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner, 1910. 12mo., ii, lviii and 1512 pp.

<sup>9</sup>Ministero di Agricoltura, Industria e Commercio (Direzione Generale della Statistica), *Statistica delle Biblioteche*. Parte I, Volume I. Roma: Tipografia Nazionale di G. Bertero, 1893. 8vo., xlvi and 208 pp. Parte I, Volume II. Roma; 1894. 8vo., iv and 295 pp. Parte II. Roma: 1896. 8vo., xvi and 154 pp.

<sup>10</sup>See *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th ed., s. v. Libraries (Vol. XIV, 1882, p. 529).

<sup>11</sup>Dr. Johann Bohatta und Dr. Michael Holzmänn, *Adressbuch der Bibliotheken der Oesterreich-ungarischen Monarchie*. Wien: Carl Fromme, . . . 1900. 8vo., viii, 576 and 5 pp. (Schriften des "Oesterreichischen Vereines für Bibliothekswesen.")



copies preserved in some 181 libraries. Allowing for omissions and judging partly by the case of Germany, we may assume the figure 70,000 for the copies in the public and monastic libraries. Of private libraries in Austria we know but little, but we can safely credit them with 15,000 copies considering their proximity to Germany on the one hand and to Italy on the other, thus giving a total for Austria of 85,000 copies.

Trübner's *Minerva* gives a total of 36,920 copies for only 29 libraries.

#### d. England (U. K.).

It seems very strange that so little is known concerning the statistics of the collections of incunabula to be found in English libraries both public and private. The British Museum contains more than 10,000 copies,<sup>12</sup> but beyond this pertinent information was found to be difficult to obtain. Mr. R. A. Peddie, in the letter previously drawn upon for editions, says: "It is impossible to say how many 15th. century books there are in this country. No statistics are available."

The universities are, however, known to have large collections of incunabula, and many other public libraries are doubtless also well supplied with them. We may, therefore, assume the number 50,000 for the public libraries of the United Kingdom.

English private libraries appear to be particularly numerous and important, and the collecting of incunabula and other rare books in England has at times assumed the proportions of a craze. We can, therefore, posit the number 25,000 for the private libraries of the country, and thus reach a total of 75,000 copies for England, including Scotland and Ireland.

Trübner's *Minerva* gives statistics for only one library, the Rylands Library at Manchester with its 2500 copies.

#### e. France.

The smaller public libraries of France appear to have been carefully catalogued as regards incu-

nabula, and fairly complete statistics are available; but in regard to the number of incunabula in the larger public libraries there still seems to be room for doubt. For the semi-public and private libraries no information is at hand.

In 1897 M. Léopold Delisle stated<sup>13</sup> that Mlle. Marie Pellechet had examined four large libraries in Paris and 176 libraries in the provinces, all of which presumably contained incunabula. He stated further that she records in her first volume the existence of some 6272 copies. At the same average rate for the remaining volumes the completed work will record 34,346 copies. Making allowances for some omissions, especially in the larger libraries, and for others not examined by her, we may estimate the total number of incunabula in the public and semi-public libraries of France at 50,000 copies.

As the French are enthusiastic collectors of rare books we may estimate the number of incunabula in private libraries at 20,000, thus bringing the total for all the libraries of France to some 70,000 copies.

Trübner's *Minerva* gives statistics for 118 libraries, most of them actual counts, which total 18,861 copies.

#### f. Spain.

The only available statistics for incunabula in Spanish libraries appear to be those given by Trübner's *Minerva*, which lists only eight libraries with 4679 copies. But Dr. Häbler in the letter previously cited states that the Prussian commission has an expert now in Spain, and that he has been reporting quite a large number of incunabula in the Spanish libraries. When his investigation is completed the results may show from 40,000 to 50,000 copies in the public libraries.

Adopting the smaller figure, and allowing 10,000 copies for the private libraries, we would arrive at a total of 50,000 copies for all the libraries of Spain.

#### g. Russia.

Library statistics for Russia have been largely inaccessible, but through the kindness of Mr. Babine of the Library of Congress in Washing-

<sup>12</sup> Reginald Arthur Rye, *The Libraries of London: A Guide for Students*, prepared on the instruction of the Senate of the University of London. London: published by the University of London, 1908. 8vo., 90 pp. See p. 14.

<sup>13</sup> See his review of Mlle. Pellechet's *Catalogue Général des Incunables des Bibliothèques Publiques de France*, Tome I, in the *Journal des Savants*, Année 1897, pp. 613-627. (Letter from M. Louis Polain received too late to use.)



ton it has been ascertained that the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg contains 7000 incunabula.

It seems likely also that many libraries in Russian territory near the Western frontier contain large collections of incunabula, so that we may estimate 40,000 copies for all the libraries of Russia.

#### h. America.

Of late years many small collections of incunabula have been finding their way to American libraries, and under the auspices of the Bibliographical Society of America an effort is now being made to compile a checklist of them both for public and private libraries.

Through the kindness of Miss Margaret W. Righter of the Free Library of Philadelphia it has been learned that on May 6, 1910, the contents of 71 public libraries with 4841 copies and 61 private libraries with 3366 copies had been listed.

Allowing liberally for collections not yet catalogued, we may estimate that 20,000 copies exist in all the libraries of America.

#### i. Minor Collections.

There are also a few statistics available for other countries whose libraries contain a certain number of incunabula. Basing our estimates on these meagre data, and taking into consideration the importance of their libraries, we may add somewhat to our totals in the summary statistical table which follows.

Incunabula in small numbers are probably scattered far and wide, as the colonization of many countries by European peoples has tended to disseminate the products of the early printing presses.

STATISTICAL TABLE.

Countries.	Estimates.
a. Germany, . . . . .	140,000
b. Italy, . . . . .	90,000
c. Austria, . . . . .	85,000
d. England, . . . . .	75,000
e. France, . . . . .	70,000
f. Spain, . . . . .	50,000
g. Russia, . . . . .	40,000
h. America, . . . . .	20,000
i. Switzerland, . . . . .	10,000
j. Belgium, . . . . .	10,000

Countries.	Estimates.
k. Holland, . . . . .	10,000
l. Denmark, . . . . .	5,000
m. Portugal, . . . . .	5,000
n. Sweden, . . . . .	5,000
o. English Colonies, . . . . .	10,000
p. Other Countries, . . . . .	25,000
Grand Total, . . . . .	650,000

As the present World Census of Incunabula would appear to be the first attempt in this field, its imperfections and inexactitudes are probably many, but no one will watch with greater interest than its author what the results of later investigations by the incunabulum specialists will be as compared with the above forecast.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

#### CAXTON REPRODUCTIONS : A BIBLIOGRAPHY.

American students of Caxton are dependent for the materials of their study almost wholly upon reproductions, since the number of original Caxtons owned by public institutions in America is extremely small. It has therefore seemed to me that a list of these reproductions may be of service to present or future students of the subject. I have included in this list all of the works of Caxton's press of which reproductions are known to me. But in the case of a few works of which the reprints are rather numerous, I have not tried to include every edition. Nor have I tried to give more in the way of bibliographical detail than will suffice for practical purposes.

Caxton's works are here referred to by means of the numbers and titles given in Blades' list, as set forth in his *Biography and Typography of William Caxton*, L. 1877, pp. 165 ff. Blades' list, tho not perfect for all purposes, is very accurate, perfectly definite, and well known, and it furnishes the simplest means of defining with exactness a given work of Caxton's press. In the case of works of which Caxton published several editions, the numbers denoting the later editions are set down side by side with the

number that denotes the first edition. A list of Caxton's works, with the numbers of Blades' list, is printed in Flügel's *Neuenglisches Lesebuch*, pp. 359-361. Blades' larger work, *The Life and Typography of William Caxton*, L. 1861-'63, 2 vols., is referred to below as Blades, I or II, according to the volume cited.

## Blades' list.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1 The recuyell of the histories of Troy.<br/>Reprint, ed. H. O. Sommer, L. 1894, 2 vols.<br/>" Kelmscott Press, 1892, 2 vols.</p> <p>3, 34 The game and play of the chess moralised.<br/>Facsimile, ed. Vincent Figgins, L. 1860,<br/>from 2° ed.<br/>Reprint, ed. W. E. A. Axon, L. 1883,<br/>from 1° ed.</p> <p>8, 28, 89 The dictes and sayings of the philosophers.<br/>Facsimile, ed. W. Blades, L. 1877.</p> <p>9 Fragment of a "Horae."<br/>Reprint in Blades, vol. II, p. 42-43.</p> <p>11 The moral proverbs of Cristyne.<br/>*Facsimile (?), ed. W. Blades, 1859.</p> <p>14, 15, 30 Parvus Catho.—Magnus Catho.<br/>Facsimile, Camb. Univ. Press, 1906.</p> <p>16, 17 The horse, the sheep, and the goose, etc.<br/>Reprint, Roxburghe Club, 1822.</p> <p>18 Infancia Salvatoris.<br/>Reprint, ed. F. Holthausen, Halle, 1891.</p> <p>19 The temple of glass.<br/>Facsimile, Camb. Univ. Press, 1905.</p> <p>20, 21 The chorle and the bird.<br/>Facsimile, Camb. Univ. Press, 1906.<br/>Reprint, Roxburghe Club, 1818.</p> <p>22 The temple of brass, or the parliament of fowls,<br/>etc.<br/>Reprint, in Parallel Text of Chaucer's<br/>Minor Poems, Chaucer Soc.</p> <p>23, 94 The book of courtesy.<br/>Facsimile, Camb. Univ. Press, 1907.<br/>Reprint, ed. F. J. Furnivall, E. E. T. S.,<br/>L. 1868.</p> <p>24 Queen Anelida and false Arcyte, etc.<br/>Facsimile, Camb. Univ. Press, 1905.<br/>Reprint in Parallel Text of Chaucer's<br/>Minor Poems, Chaucer Soc.</p> <p>25 Boethius De consolacione philosophiae . . . by<br/>Geoffrey Chaucer.<br/>Collation by L. Kellner, Eng. Stud. 14.<br/>1-53.</p> <p>29 Letters of indulgence issued by John Kendal<br/>in 1480, etc.<br/>Facsimile in F. C. Price's Facsimiles il-<br/>lustrating the labors of William Caxton,<br/>L. 1877, privately printed.<br/>Reprint in Blades, II, p. 79.</p> <p>32, 84 The history of Reynard the fox.</p> | <p>35 An advertisement.<br/>Facsimile, ed. E. W. B. Nicholson, L.<br/>[1892].<br/>Facsimile, Bibliophile, March, 1908.<br/>Reprints in Blades, II, p. 101, and else-<br/>where.</p> <p>36 Directorium, seu Pica Sarum.<br/>Reprint in Tracts of Clement Maydeston<br/>with the remains of Caxton's Ordinale,<br/>ed. Chr. Wordsworth, Henry Bradshaw<br/>Soc., L. 1894.</p> <p>42 The history of Godfrey of Bolyne; or the con-<br/>quest of Jerusalem.<br/>Reprint, ed. M. N. Colvin, E. E. T. S., L.<br/>1893.<br/>Reprint, Kelmscott Press, 1893.</p> <p>43, 44 Letters of indulgence from Johannes de Lei-<br/>gliis, etc.<br/>Facsimile in Blades, II, p. 184.</p> <p>46 Polycronicon.<br/>Printed from MSS., with the variants of<br/>Caxton's edition, in Rolls Series, ed.<br/>Churchill Babington, L. 1865-86.<br/>Liber ultimus is reprinted in Blades, I, p.<br/>197-265.</p> <p>47 The pilgrimage of the soul.<br/>Reprint, ed. Katherine I. Cust, L. 1859.<br/>"The parts omitted," says the editor, "re-<br/>late entirely to Mariolatry . . . and con-<br/>tain quaint descriptions of purgatory and<br/>abstruse metaphysical doctrines, which it<br/>was felt could neither be of advantage nor<br/>interest to the general reader."</p> <p>48 A vocabulary in French and English.<br/>Reprint, ed. Henry Bradley, E. E. T. S.,<br/>L. 1900.</p> <p>50, 96 Four sermons, etc.<br/>Reprint, Roxburghe Club, 1883.</p> <p>52 Sex perelegantissimæ epistolæ per Petrum Car-<br/>melianum emendatæ.<br/>Facsimile, ed. G. Bullen, L. 1892.</p> <p>54 The book which the Knight of the Tower<br/>made, etc.<br/>Reprint, ed. Thomas Wright, E. E. T. S.,<br/>1906, revised ed.<br/>This edition is made in part from Harl. ms.<br/>1764, and in part from Caxton's print.<br/>The original issue of 1868 is not trust-<br/>worthy.</p> <p>56, 69, 101 The golden legend.<br/>Facsimile, ed. Alfred Aspland, L. 1878.<br/>This facsimile reproduces a very imperfect<br/>copy.<br/>Reprint, Temple Classics, L. 1900, 7 vols.<br/>" Kelmscott Press, 1892, 3 vols.</p> |
|--|---|

- 57 Death-bed prayers.  
Facsimile in Blades, II, Plate xxxvii.
- 58 The fables of Æsop; of Avian; of Alfonse; and of Poge, the Florentine.  
Reprint, ed. Joseph Jacobs, L. 1889, 2 vols.
- 59 The order of chivalry.  
Reprint, ed. F. S. Ellis, Kelmscott Press, 1892.
- 61 The book of fame.  
Reprint, in Parallel Text of Chaucer's Minor Poems, Chaucer Soc.
- 62 The curial.  
Reprint, ed. F. J. Furnivall, E. E. T. S., L. 1888.
- 64 The life of Our Lady.  
\*Reprinted, according to Horstmann, Altenglische Legenden, Neue Folge, 376, in Early English Religious Literature, [L. 1871-79.] From ms. or from Caxton's print?
- 65 The life of the holy and blessed virgin St. Winifred.  
Reprint, ed. C. Horstmann, Anglia, vol. 3.
- 66 The noble histories of king Arthur, etc.  
Reprint, ed. H. O. Sommer, L. 1889-91, 3 vols.  
This is much the best edition of Malory. There are, of course, many others.
- 67 The life of the noble and christian prince, Charles the Great.  
Reprint, ed. S. J. H. Herrtage, E. E. T. S., L. 1881.
- 68 The knight Paris and the fair Vienne.  
Reprint, ed. W. C. Hazlitt, Roxburghe Library, [L.] [1868].
- 75 Image of Pity.  
Facsimile in E. G. Duff's William Caxton, Caxton Club, Chicago, 1905, Plate xiv.
- 82 Statutes of Henry VII.  
Facsimile, ed. John Rae, L. 1869.
- 83 The governal of health.—The medicina stomachi.  
\*Reprint, ed. W. Blades, 1858.
- 85 The history of Blanchardin and Eglantine.  
Reprint, ed. Leon Kellner, E. E. T. S., L. 1890.
- 86 The four sons of Aymon.  
Reprint, ed. Octavia Richardson, E. E. T. S., L. 1884-85.
- 88 Eneydos.  
Reprint, ed. W. T. Culley and F. J. Furnivall, E. E. T. S., L. 1890.
- 92 The fifteen Oes, and other prayers.  
Facsimile, ed. Stephen Ayling, L. 1869.
- 93 The art and craft to know well to die.  
Facsimile, L. Lumley, L. 1875.
- 97 Ars moriendi, etc.  
Facsimile, ed. E. W. B. Nicholson, L. 1891 (?)
- Facsimile, no place, no date.  
\*Reprint, ed. W. Blades, 1869.
- 100 The life of St. Katherine.—The revelations of St. Elizabeth of Hungary.  
Reprint, ed. C. Horstmann, Herrig's Archiv, vol. 76.
- Caxton's translation of six books of Ovid's Metamorphoses, MS. 2124, Pepysian library, Camb. (see Blades, '77, p. 364).  
Reprint, ed. G. Hibbert, Roxburghe Club, 1819.
- Indulgence of 1489 (not recognized by Blades as a work of Caxton).  
Facsimile in E. G. Duff, op. cit., Plate xviii.  
Facsimile in Seymour de Ricci, A census of Caxtons, Oxf., 1909.
- Caxton's prologs and epilogs are all reprinted by Blades, I, 131-196.
- A reprint of Caxton's translation of the Vitæ patrum, finished at the very end of his life (see Blades, '77, p. 85), is referred to in Jahresbericht, 1895. I have not been able to identify the reprint.
- \*These books I have not seen.

A comparison of this list with Blades' full list of 103 numbers shows that up to the present time a little more than half of the whole extant number of Caxtoniana has been reproduced in some way or other. Nearly forty works, not including second or third editions which are mere duplicates of the first issues, are still inaccessible to students unable to consult the originals in the great libraries of England. The works which have not been reproduced are probably on the whole not less valuable than those which have been reproduced. They include the following works:—7, The history of Jason (the only Caxton romance not reprinted); 31, The mirrour of the world; 55, Caton; 74, The royal book; 81, The fayts of arms and of chivalry; 91, A book of divers ghostly matters. It should be noted also that most of the facsimiles and some of the reprints have appeared in limited editions and are now difficult to procure. It is to be hoped therefore that the work of reproduction will continue and that good reprints will speedily be made of all Caxtons that have not been reproduced in any form, and also of all those which are accessible only in scarce, out-of-print facsimiles.

SAMUEL MOORE.

Harvard University.



### A PARACELSIAN PASSAGE IN GOETHE'S *EPHEMERIDES*.

In February, 1770, before leaving his native city to attend the University of Strasburg, Goethe copied in his notebook *Ephemerides* a number of quotations from Paracelsus, to one of which I wish to call attention. It runs :

"Darum ich wohl mag reden, dasz die Artzt, so die *Cadaverum Anatomiam* für sich nehmen, nichts als unverständlich Leut sind, dann nicht der *Cadaver* zeigt die *Anatomey*, dann sie giebt allein die Bein, und des Beins Nachbaaren, noch ist aber die Kranckheit nicht da." <sup>1</sup>

Although at that time Goethe was interested in the neo-Platonic mystical phases of medicine, nevertheless it may, with a reasonable degree of certainty, be inferred from the point at which his quotation begins, and the point at which it ends, that it was not so much Paracelsus's mystical distinction between the anatomy of the "cadaver" and that of the "corpus" of a particular disease that interested him, as it was the bold statement that an anatomical dissection reveals the bones and the adjacent parts of the body, but not the disease, since the disease is not among the remains.

Perhaps it should be our first aim to make as clear as possible what Paracelsus means in the above quotation. To do this it will be necessary to give the context, besides quoting an earlier passage. The latter first :

"So ich nuhn soll vom *Corpus* reden des Zipperlins / so wissen anfänglich in dieser Vorred dass alle ding die uns peinigen oder wolthundt / nicht auss dem *Corpore*, aber im *Corpore* ihr werck verbringen : Dann die kranckheit ist unsichtig niemandts hats nie gesehen / das *Corpus* aber dasselbige ist sichtig / das ist das / dass wir klagen / das uns peiniget." <sup>2</sup>

Goethe's passage is from the chapter "De Podagricis, Liber Secundus," and I quote the context : "also sollen ihr an dem ort auch wissen und erkennen / dass das *Podagra*, so es in sein

*Corpus* genommen soll werden und geformiert in sein *Anatomey* unnd in sein *proprietates*, dass ihr nicht anderst verstanden / dann das der Leib / der von Vatter und Mutter geboren wirdt / dieser Leib nicht ist / auch nichts in ihn zu handeln. Dann den *Flamen* sieht man auffsteigen / aber sein *corpus* nicht auss dem er kompt. Also den Schmetzen empfindt man / aber sein *corpus* sieht niemandts. Auff das soll ein ander Grund gefürt werden in erkanntnuss des *Podagram* / dann von allen dingen soll sein *Anatomey* stehn / und welcher der ist / der nicht der *Kranckheit* *Anatomey* weist / kan der ein Artzt seyn? [Here follows Goethe's quotation.] Ich rede von der *Anatomey* der *Kranckheiten* / nit des Leibs : darumb führe ich hie die *Astra*, allein auss denselbigen anzeigungen die *Anatomey* der *Kranckheiten* / dass ich für das höchst und dz erst acht zu seyn einem jeglichen Artzt : ohn welche *Anatomey* nie nichts warhafftigs geschrieben ist worden." <sup>3</sup>

Paracelsus believed that the processes of life are independent of the physical structure of the organs of the body and he was willing to apply the term anatomy only to what he considered the necessary foundation of medicine, viz., a knowledge of the ultimate substance of life. It was only the whole full life of nature and man that had any significance for him. <sup>4</sup>

A disease, considered as to its ultimate substance, did not mean to him a material thing, but a spiritual, living thing. <sup>5</sup> While we should not venture to assert that Goethe accepted this doctrine with its consequences, nevertheless there is embodied in the short passage which he copied an idea which became with him a fundamental principle, namely the all-importance of studying an organism as a living thing, not as a mechanism. There is a passage in the *Urfaust* (367-372) that suggests itself in this connection :

"Wer will was lebigs erkennen und beschreiben,  
Muss erst den Geist herausser treiben,  
Dann hat er die Theil in seiner Hand,  
Fehlt leider nur das geistlich Band.  
Encheiresin naturae nennts die Chimie!  
Bohrt sich selbst einen Esel und weis nicht wie."

<sup>1</sup>Schöll, *Briefe und Aufsätze von Goethe*, 76; *Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts in Neudrucken*, xiv, 8; Weimar ed. of Goethe, xxxvii, 87.

<sup>2</sup>*Opera*, ed. Huser, Strasburg, 1603, i, 569.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 573.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Haeser, *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Medicin*, 3d ed., ii, 87.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 95.

Schröer and Steiner, the former in his preface, the latter in his introduction to vol. XXXIII of the D. N. L. edition of Goethe's works, interpret these lines as referring both to chemistry and anatomy. The lines are frequently quoted as embodying a general principle of quite broad bearing, and this may well be done without doing any violence to Goethe's belief, though we shall see later that he was thinking specifically of chemistry, or perhaps alchemy, when he wrote the passage. Back in Leipsic, before he had read Paracelsus, he wrote the little poem, *Die Freuden*, ending with the line,

"So geht es dir, Zergliederer deiner Freuden."

As has been pointed out by Schröer,<sup>6</sup> Goethe's main idea in this poem, confirmed by the passage from Paracelsus, was more clearly and more fully stated in a letter to Hetzler Jr., on the 14th of July, 1770, "... der Leichnam ist nicht das ganze Thier, es gehört noch etwas dazu, noch ein Hauptstück, und bei der Gelegenheit, wie bey ieder andern, ein sehr hauptsächliches Hauptstück: das Leben, der Geist der alles schön macht. . . lassen Sie mir die Freudenfeindliche Erfahrungssucht, die Sommervögel tödtet und Blumen anatomirt, alten oder kalten Leuten."<sup>7</sup>

Schröer's quotation of the Paracelsian passage as a parallel to lines 1936 ff. of *Faust* has lost some of its weight since Lippmann's discovery of Goethe's source for the chemical terms employed in these lines of *Faust*,<sup>8</sup> though it is easily conceivable that Goethe may have had the general principle in mind in the first four lines, even though the words "den Geist heraus zu treiben" be clearly (al)chemical, and the last two lines contain a stinging gibe at a pretentious, albeit rare, specimen of chemical terminology. However, it should not be deduced from what has been said that Goethe thought little of chemistry or despised anatomy, for his many experiments in the one and his important discoveries in the other prove exactly the opposite.

The fact that Goethe seems to have been fond

<sup>6</sup>*Chronik des Wiener Goethe-Vereins*, VII, Nr. 8, p. 31; and *Faust*, mit Einl., etc. 3te Aufl. 1892, p. 124 f.

<sup>7</sup>*Briefe*, I, 238 f.

<sup>8</sup>*Chemiker-Zeitung*, 1907, Nr. 36, "Encheiresis Naturae." See also *G.-J.*, XXIX, 163 f.

of the idea common to all these passages leads me to venture the opinion that he, and not Schiller, was the author of the xenion, *Der Sprachforscher*, Anatomieren magst du die Sprache, doch nur ihr Cadaver; Geist und Leben entschlüpft flüchtig dem groben Scalpell.<sup>9</sup>

The only authority, so far as I know, upon which this distich has ever been attributed to Schiller, is the fact that Schiller's wife wrote "Sch." after it in her *de luxe* copy of the *Xenien* volume of the *Musen-Almanach*.<sup>10</sup> Even Hoffmeister, who proudly boasted that the possession of that "Prachtexemplar" enabled him to name the author of each of the *Votivtafeln* and most of the *Xenien*, was nevertheless in fact very skeptical of the results with respect to some of the *Votivtafeln*, though still cocksure with regard to the *Xenien*.<sup>11</sup> The scientific value of that "Prachtexemplar" was soon attacked by certain scholars, though still defended by others.<sup>12</sup> The discovery and publication of the old manuscript that had wandered back and forth between Weimar and Jena, growing with each journey, seemed to have considerable weight in the problem of dividing the literary ownership,<sup>13</sup> since for the most part the distichs are in the hand of one or the other of the poets. But even such manuscript evidence has not been universally accepted as convincing. For example, Erich Schmidt makes it appear highly probable that Goethe was the author of three of the distichs that appear in this manuscript in Schiller's hand.<sup>14</sup> Seeing that the xenion here under discussion does not even appear in that original manuscript, and the evidence of the passage from Paracelsus, the letter to Hetzler, the lines from *Faust*, and the peculiarly Goethean tendency of the distich, all oppose the conjecture of Charlotte v. Schiller, it would seem permissible to claim for Goethe the authorship of the lines, the more so as no documentary evidence has ever been brought forward to substantiate the claim of Lotte Schiller.

<sup>9</sup>*Musen-Almanach für das Jahr 1797*, hrsg. von Schiller, p. 234. No. 353 in the edition of Schmidt and Suphan, *Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft*, viii.

<sup>10</sup>Hoffmeister, *Nachlese zu Schillers Werken*, III, 72, 104.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, 74 ff., 104 ff.

<sup>12</sup>Boas, *Schiller und Goethe im Xenienkampf*, I, 41 ff.

<sup>13</sup>Cf. Boas-Maltzahn, *Schillers und Goethes Xenien-Manuscript*, p. 35.

<sup>14</sup>*Charakteristiken*, Berlin, 1886, p. 318 f.

Goethe's contempt for the mirth-provoking, rather than respect-commanding perpetrations of philologists, especially dictionary etymologists, of the time, needs no new demonstration. Suffice it to refer to the poem *Etymologie*, supposed to be spoken by Mephistopheles, and to the lines in *Faust* (7093 ff.) in which the Greif gives vent to his displeasure at being wrongly called "Greis":

"Nicht Greisen! Greifen! — Niemand hört es gern  
Daz man ihn Greis nennt. Jedem Worte klingt  
Der Ursprung nach wo es sich her bedingt:  
Grau, grämlich, griesgram, greulich, Gräber, grimmig,  
Etymologisch gleicherweise stimmig,  
Verstimmen uns.

MEPHISTOPHELES.

Und doch, nicht abzuschweifen,  
Gefällt das *Grei* im Ehrentitel *Greifen*.

GREIF.

Natürlich! die Verwandtschaft ist erprobt,  
Zwar oft gescholten, mehr jedoch gelobt;  
Man greife nun nach Mädchen, Kronen, Gold,  
Dem Greifenden ist meist Fortuna hold.

W. A. COOPER.

Stanford University.

# THE WEAVERS' INSCRIPTION IN THE CATHEDRAL OF CHARTRES.

In the chapel of the Sacred Heart of Mary, on the North side of the cathedral of Chartres, is a window given by the "métier des tisserands" of that town and dedicated to Saint Vincent. Underneath it, near the medallions where the weavers are represented, this inscription<sup>1</sup> can still be read:

TERA : A CEST : AVTEL : TES : LES : MESSES :  
QEN : CHARE : SONT : ACOILLI : EN : TO  
ERET : CESTE : VERRIE : CENT : CIL : QVIDO :  
LI : CONFRERE : SAINT : VIN

This inscription has greatly puzzled the archaeologists who have discussed it. M. Mâle speaks of it as an "inscription très obscure, dont on ne

peut qu'entrevoir le sens." De Lasteyrie<sup>2</sup> suggested the following interpretation: "A cet autel, toutes les messes qui en charge sont accueillies . . . et donnèrent cette verrière . . . ceux qui sont confrères de Saint Vincent." This reading is far from giving a clear meaning or an exact interpretation of all the letters of the inscription. All that follows from it is that a "confrérie" of Saint Vincent gave the window; their connection with the altar and the masses is not apparent.

I believe that it is possible to reach a more precise and literal rendering of the inscription. When we adopt the usual method, as de Lasteyrie evidently did, beginning at the top and reading down, it appears confused, full of gaps and inversions. Suppose, however, that we apply the method used in reading the pictures in the "vitraux." It is well known that the mediæval glass-workers, when preparing a window, began at the bottom and worked up. It is thus that most of the "vitraux," whether historical, mystical or dogmatic, are to be read.<sup>3</sup> Adopting this method for the inscription and numbering the words as follows:

17	18	19	20	13	14	15
QEN	CHARE	SONT	ACOILLI	EN	TO	
16	17	10	11	12	13	
ERET	CESTE	VERRIE	CENT	CIL	QVIDO	
7	8	9	4	5	6	7
LI	CONFRERE	SAINT	VIN			
1	2	3	4			

we get this result: "Li confrere saint Vincent cil qui doëret ceste verrie sont acoilli en totes les messes qen charetera a cest autel."

Thus read, everything is in order except for the words *charetera* and *verrie*. And it becomes almost self-evident that the letters RE of the former belong with VERRIE of the line below, forming *verrière*, and that they should be replaced by an N or a nasal bar, forming *chantera*. The whole inscription would then read: "Li confrere saint Vincent, cil qui donerent ceste verriere, sont acoilli en totes les messes q'en chantera a cest autel." Or, in Modern French: "Les confrères de saint Vincent, ceux qui donnèrent cette ver-

<sup>1</sup> Facsimile by F. de Méry in *Revue de l'art chrétien*, 1888, p. 422. See also E. Mâle, *L'Art religieux au xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle*, p. 367 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Histoire de la peinture sur verre*, p. 527.

<sup>3</sup> See Mâle, *op. cit.*, p. 55.



rière, sont accueillis en toutes les messes qu'on chantera à cet autel."

In this way we obtain a perfectly legible and grammatical Old French sentence, making good sense and accounting for every letter of the inscription. I have been unable to ascertain whether weavers' guilds elsewhere had any special relations with Saint Vincent, but it is evident that at Chartres the "tisserands" had formed a fraternity under his patronage, had dedicated a window to him and in it asserted also the right to be present at all the masses celebrated on the neighboring altar.

WILLIAM P. SHEPARD.

Hamilton College.

#### THE TEXT OF SHERIDAN'S *THE RIVALS*.

On its first presentation *The Rivals* was a failure. Most conspicuous among its objectionable features, as noted by the newspaper critics, was its extraordinary length: "The play itself is a full hour longer in representation than any piece on the stage.—This last circumstance is an error of such a nature as shows either great obstinacy in the Author, or excessive ignorance in the managers."<sup>1</sup> Sheridan at once withdrew the play for revision. Since the manuscript of the play as originally performed has been lost, the extent of this revision can only be guessed at. A comparison, however, of the rather detailed criticism in *The Public Ledger* (January 18, 1775) with the present text of the play gives us a notion of how sweeping some of the alterations were. Moreover, the first edition misnumbers the scenes (in Act III omitting scene 4, in Act IV omitting scene 3) in such a way as to suggest that Sheridan possibly suppressed two whole scenes, and forgot to renumber the following ones. In order to reduce the play by one-third, something like the suppression of certain scenes may have been necessary.

After the success of the play on its second production, Sheridan made ready the manuscript for

the press, and added a modestly-worded Preface, in which he defended himself and the manager of the Covent Garden Theatre against certain charges occasioned by the first night's failure. Sheridan prepared this edition, in all probability, with care, for, in a certain sense, his reputation as a playwright was at stake. It was published in London, by John Wilkie, in 1775, and is now one of the rare books in our language, fetching on the market from \$50 to \$250. In the same year appeared the second edition. In reality this is nothing but a later issue of the first edition, from the same setting of type, and differing merely in having inserted on the title page the words "The Second Edition."

In the following year, however, Wilkie issued "The Third Edition, Corrected." This seems to represent the stage version of the play as then acted. It contains the old Serjeant-at-Law prologue in a slightly modified form; prints for the first time the "Prologue Spoken on the Tenth Night"; makes a few verbal changes in the text; and, most noticeable of all, omits a large number of passages. These omissions, doubtless, represent actual "cuts" made by the actors. As such they may have had the sanction of Sheridan, though in matters of this kind he was notoriously careless.

In 1821 Murray published Sheridan's plays in two volumes. Moore furnished an introduction, and Wilkie, it seems, acted as editor.<sup>2</sup> In this edition *The Rivals* was printed from the third, or "truncated" edition, but with modernizations and some minor changes made by the editor. All subsequent reprints of *The Rivals* (with two exceptions to be spoken of in the following paragraphs) have been made directly, or indirectly, from this Murray edition of 1821.

In 1902 Fraser Rae issued *Sheridan's Plays, Now Printed as He Wrote Them*. (The title on the cover runs *Sheridan's Plays First Printed from His MSS.*). In his Prefatory Notes Rae says: "Sheridan's grandfather gave much time and care to arranging the manuscript of 'The Rivals,' 'The Duenna,' 'The School for Scandal,' and 'The Critic,' and he had them bound in handsome volumes." The word "grandfather"

<sup>1</sup>*The Morning Chronicle*, January 20, 1775.

<sup>2</sup>See Rae, *Sheridan's Plays*, p. xiv.

was obviously a slip of the pen, for both of Sheridan's grandfathers were dead long before *The Rivals* was written. Mrs. Algernon Sheridan writes me: "What Rae can have in mind when he spoke of Sheridan's grandfather arranging the manuscripts, one does not know—possibly he meant that his grandson did so, which is undoubtedly true of every other play except *The Rivals*." And that Rae did mean 'grandson' is conclusively shown on p. xxxviii. Rae adds: "The only important manuscript of which there is no trace is that of 'The Rivals,' which was acquired by Mr. Harris, the manager of Covent Garden Theatre, the manuscript being probably destroyed when that theatre was burnt to the ground." Without further explanation he prints a text of *The Rivals* which differs from that of all previous editions.

Now, although Rae does not actually say so, and probably did not intend to deceive the public, the inference from his statements and from his whole edition is that although one manuscript of *The Rivals* (the original manuscript put into the hands of the manager, Mr. Harris) was destroyed, another manuscript (possibly the manuscript of the revised play as rewritten for the second performance, or possibly that prepared for the printer) still exists; that it was, as were the other extant manuscripts, handsomely bound by Sheridan's grandson, and is preserved with them at Frampton Court; and that it is reproduced "with absolute fidelity in this volume."

When Professor Nettleton issued his admirable *The Major Dramas of Sheridan* (in *The Athenæum Press Series*, 1906), he accepted Rae's text as having reproduced "the original manuscript." In his introductory note on "The Text of *The Rivals*," he says: "The text of *The Rivals* in this edition is taken, by Mr. Fraser Rae's generous permission, from his *Sheridan's Plays now printed as he wrote them* (London, 1902). Of this book he once wrote me: 'I copied Sheridan's text in order that a reader might have it before him, just as he would do if he had the original manuscript.' This text—'Sheridan's version, printed with absolute fidelity,' as his Prefatory Notes describe it—I have tried to reproduce with like fidelity."

But absolutely no manuscript of *The Rivals* exists. Rae himself says in his *Sheridan*, A

*Biography* (London, 1896), i, 287: "Moore makes a remark which I regretfully confirm:—'Strange! that *The Rivals* should be the only one of his pieces of which there appears to be no trace in his papers.'" Mr. Sichel, in his recent biography (*Sheridan*, i, 495), is even more specific: "The autograph of 'The Rivals' is said to have been burned at Covent Garden Theatre, and no manuscript is known to exist." I have, furthermore, a definite statement from the Sheridan family that no manuscript of the play is at Frampton Court; nor, indeed, is one known by them to exist anywhere.

There is, however, preserved at Frampton Court a copy of the first edition "with annotations—apparently in his [Sheridan's] wife's handwriting—on the margin."<sup>3</sup> Thus, opposite Mrs. Malaprop's misquotation from *Hamlet*, is written: "Overdone—fitter for farce than comedy." And on Acres's classification of oaths, the comment is made: "Very good, but above the speaker's capacity."<sup>4</sup> Moreover, the play is timed for "three hours," the first act for "28 minutes."<sup>5</sup>

Rae does not mention this copy, and has not attempted to reproduce either its text or its annotations. He seems to have prepared his edition by pasting down some modern reprint, which, like all modern reprints, reproduced the third, or "truncated," edition, as printed by Murray with modernized punctuation, spelling, and stage-directions, and not a few corruptions of text. Then, from the first edition he inserted the omitted passages. Finally, he introduced here and there corrections from the first edition. In general, however, his text, with the exception of the inserted passages, represents some modern text, with modern stage-directions and punctuation, and accumulated verbal errors.<sup>6</sup> In printing, too, he carelessly dropped out a number of words, and allowed additional errors to creep in.<sup>7</sup> Obviously such a text has no

<sup>3</sup> Sichel, *Sheridan*, i, 489. This copy, however, belonged to Sheridan's brother-in-law, Tickell, and Moore asserts that the annotations are in the handwriting of Tickell.

<sup>4</sup> Fitzgerald, *The Lives of the Sheridans*, i, 123.

<sup>5</sup> Sichel, *Sheridan*, i, 496.

<sup>6</sup> For purposes of comparison one may use the edition by G. G. S., or the Temple Edition.

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion of Rae's carelessness in reprinting, the reader is referred to Sichel, *Sheridan*, i, 492, where Mr. Sichel shows, with quotations, that Rae's reprint of Mrs. Sheridan's *A Journey to Bath* is "full of inaccuracies."

scholarly value, and Professor Nettleton took useless pains in reproducing it.

The inconsistencies and inaccuracies of Rae's text are too numerous to be given here in full; for the purposes of this article a few illustrations will be sufficient.

Prologue (p. 7, l. 5)<sup>8</sup> The first edition reads:

How's this! The Poet's Brief again! O ho!

The third edition reads:

Hey! how's this?—Dibble!—sure it cannot be!

Rae combines the two, to the destruction of the metre, as follows:

Hey! how's this? The Poet's Brief again. O ho!

This, it will be observed, represents one of Rae's attempts to introduce the reading of the first edition: it contains three errors. The next five lines (ll. 6–10) are from the third edition. Why should Rae alter line 5 to the reading of the first edition, yet leave lines 6–10 unchanged? Line 6 contains the error common to modern reprints, of "Yes" for "Yea."

For further illustration I will quote a few passages, chosen almost at random. I give first the reading of Rae's text, and secondly the reading of the first edition and of the annotated edition.<sup>9</sup>

Page 3, l. 7. by the public: as public.

Page 12, l. 50. easily: easy.

Page 13, l. 61. we got: he got.

Page 16, l. 61. absolutely fallen: fallen absolutely.

Page 16, l. 65. really: absolutely.

Page 27, l. 52. I should: I shall.

Page 50, l. 49. fixed: had fixed.

Page 53, l. 36. Oh! it gives: It gives.

Page 64, l. 2. a St. Lucius: a Sir Lucius.

Page 71, l. 60. my Aunt must be: my Aunt is.

Page 74, l. 166. like to have a little fooling: like a little fooling.

The conclusion is obvious: the only complete and authoritative text of *The Rivals* is the first edition; this has never been reprinted.<sup>10</sup>

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

Cornell University.

<sup>8</sup> For the sake of convenience the page and line-numbers are given to Professor Nettleton's reprint of Rae: in Rae's edition the lines are not numbered.

<sup>9</sup> The readings of this edition were kindly furnished me by Mrs. Algernon Sheridan.

<sup>10</sup> It should be observed, however, that Professor Nettleton has given in foot-notes the more important variants in the first three editions.

# RICHARD III, iv. 4 AND THE THREE MARYS OF THE MEDIAEVAL DRAMA.

At the opening of *Richard III*, iv. 4, Margaret of Anjou, the figure of a Nemesis that spreads its shadow over the whole tragedy, reappears upon the scene, in company with Queen Elizabeth and the Duchess of York. These three wretched women, wives and mothers of murdered husbands and of murdered children, in utter woe and abandoned hope, at once take up a common burden of lamentation for the slain and of execration of "hell's black intelligencer," King Richard the Third.

The singularity of this scene in English drama—its lyric and choric rather than dramatic nature—has not escaped notice. Professor Schelling<sup>1</sup> sees in its lyricism a resemblance to Marlowe's work; further, he says: "It would be difficult to find in the whole range of English drama a scene reproducing so completely the nature and function of the Greek choric ode." There is, without doubt, enough of a general resemblance between this scene and the classical choric ode to warrant Professor Schelling's statement. I know of no scene, however, in classical tragedy that closely resembles Shakspeare's situation in subject or in construction. From classical sources, a much nearer parallel than any the drama can furnish is the lament of Andromache, Hecuba, and Helen in Book 24 of the *Iliad*.

There is a still more striking likeness, however, so far as one or two points of resemblance are concerned, between *Richard III*, iv. 4 and a scene in the earlier miracle plays. I refer to the *placatus* of the three Marys before the tomb of Christ in the "Resurrection" of the cycle plays.<sup>2</sup> For the sake of convenient comparison, I quote here that part of the York Resurrection play which is similar in situation to *Richard III*, iv. 4.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The English Chronicle Play*, p. 93.

<sup>2</sup> *York Plays*, xxxviii; *Townley Plays*, xxvi; *Chester Plays*, xix; *Ludus Coventriae*, xxxv.

<sup>3</sup> Printed by Manly, *Specimens of the Pre-Shakspearean Drama*, I, p. 160, from *The York Plays*, edited by L. T. Smith. This part of the Resurrection play was contained in the early dramatic office for Easter, of which two versions are printed by Manly, *loc. cit.*, pp. xxii and xxxi.



[Enter the three Marys going to the Tomb.]

I. MAR. Allas! to dede I wolde be dight,  
So woo in worlde was neuere wight;  
Mi sorowe is al for that sight  
That I gune see  
Howe Criste, my maistir, moste of myght,  
Is dede fro me.

Allas, that I schulde se his pyne,  
Or yit that I his liffe schulde tyne,  
Of ilke a myschene he is medicyne  
And bote of all,  
Helpe and halde to ilke a hyne  
On hym wolde call.

II. MAR. Allas! who schall my ballis bete,  
Whanne I thynke on his woundes wete?  
Jesu, that was of loue so swete  
And neuere did ill,  
Es dede and grauen vnder the grete  
Withouten skill.

III. MAR. Withowten skill the Jewes ilkone  
That louely lorde has newly slone,  
And trepasse did he neuere none  
In no-kyn steede.  
To whome nowe schall I make my mone,  
Sen he is dede?

The similarity in situation is apparent. In each instance, three bereaved women chant their sorrow for the dead; in each instance, the complaint is pitched in a lyric key. No verbal similarities appear.

In calling attention to the parallelism between these two scenes, I have no disposition to claim that Shakspeare had the religious drama in mind when he wrote *Richard III*, iv, 4. The situation may have called up a reminiscence of the Resurrection play; or, on the contrary, the agreement may be entirely accidental. There have been indicated a sufficient number of references in Shakspeare's dramas<sup>4</sup> to miracle plays and playing to make it more than probable that Shakspeare, as a boy or young man, saw performances of these plays, although as an institution they had prac-

<sup>4</sup> *Hamlet*, III. 2. 16. The references to Herod in *Antony and Cleopatra* are undoubtedly only biblical allusions. *Hamlet*, v. 1. 299. (Cf. Tolman, *Hamlet and Other Essays*, pp. 191 ff.) *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, iv. 4. 163 ff. <sup>2</sup> *Henry IV*, III. 2. 300 and 345. (Cf. Gayley, *Representative English Comedies*, xlviii.) *Henry V*, II. 3. 37. (Cf. Rolfe's edition. Note.) *King John*, iv. 3. 121. (Cf. Rolfe's edition. Note.)

tically come to an end by the sixteenth century. Evidence is not wanting to show that it was possible for Shakspeare to have seen miracle play performances.<sup>5</sup> And yet if we were certain that Shakspeare was familiar with the miracle plays, the conclusion would not necessarily be that the scene in *Richard III* is another instance of religious play reminiscence.<sup>6</sup> The agreement between the two scenes is, however, unusual; and the three weeping queens may have been suggested to Shakspeare by his recollection of the three mourning Marys.

JAMES FINCH ROYSTER.

*The University of North Carolina.*

#### WORDSWORTH'S "MAIDEN CITY."

One of the noblest of Wordsworth's sonnets is unquestionably that "On the Extinction of the Venetian Republic," and among the best lines are:

"She was a maiden city, bright and free;  
No guilt seduced, no force could violate;  
And, when she took to herself a Mate,  
She must espouse the everlasting Sea."

Of the innumerable readers of this sonnet it would be interesting to know how many have taken the exquisite term, 'a maiden city,' to be Wordsworth's own invention, stimulated by the recollection of the well-known ceremony of wedding the Adriatic and throwing the Doge's ring into the sea. As a poetic feat this is certainly not beyond the reach of Wordsworth's imagina-

<sup>5</sup> *The Leopold Shakspeare*, xii. Halliwell-Phillips, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, I, 46-7; 50. Tolman, *Hamlet and Other Essays*, 191 ff. In his largely increased list of the performances of mediæval plays in England, Mr. Chambers (*The Mediæval Stage*, II. Appendix W) mentions no performances at Stratford-upon-Avon. He finds notices of performances at Worcester in 1576; at Northampton in 1581; at Coventry in 1584 and in 1591.

<sup>6</sup> Hope Traver, *The Four Daughters of God* (Bryn Mawr College Monographs, VI), p. 94, note 18, calls attention to similarities between the "Process" at the time of Christ's agony in Gethsemane in Arnout Greban's *Le Mystère de la Passion* and the trial scene in *The Merchant of Venice*, and contends that the similarities are "too striking to be dismissed as mere coincidences."

tion, but there is some reason to believe that in this case he was reproducing, perhaps unconsciously, a phrase suggested by an older writer.

The mere term 'maiden city' is ancient enough. It was indeed applied to the city that afterwards became Naples—the early name of which was Parthenope. But this name was due to the tradition of the siren who placed her affections on Ulysses and showed her grief when he deserted her by drowning herself. Obviously this is a very different sort of maiden city from Wordsworth's. Not uncommon in mediæval romance is the term 'maiden castle,' or rather 'castle of maidens.' Note, for example, Geoffrey of Monmouth's mention of Mount Agned, "quod nunc Castellum Puellarum," (*Hist. Regum Brit.*, II, 7) identified by Madden with Edinburgh. Other maiden castles are mentioned in the prose *Merlin* (E. E. T. S.), pp. 135, 151, 212, in Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*, XIII, 15, and a considerable number are still scattered about England. On these maiden castles the *Oxford Dictionary* remarks: "Several ancient earthworks in England are also called 'Maiden Castle': the sense may possibly be a fortress so strong as to be capable of being defended by maidens, or there may have been an allusion to some forgotten legend. Cf. the equivalent Ger. name *Magdeburg*."

Shakespeare uses the term 'maiden cities' in *Henry V*, Act v, sc. 2, where the English king is negotiating to make the French princess his queen:

"K. Hen. . . . you may, some of you, thank love for my blindness; who cannot see many a fair French city, for one fair French maid that stands in my way.

Fr. King. Yes, my lord, you see them perspectively, the cities turned into a maid; for they are all girdled with maiden walls, that war hath never entered.

K. Hen. Shall Kate be my wife?

Fr. King. So please you.

K. Hen. I am content; so the maiden cities you talk of may wait on her: so the maid that stood in the way of my wish shall show me the way to my will."

We see from the examples cited that any one of these sources might have suggested to Wordsworth the mere term 'maiden city,' but not improbably he picked it up in some of his reading

about Venice. Specific application of the term to Venice occurs in Coryat's *Crudities*, which was published in 1611, eleven years after *Henry V* was printed. Coryat does not pretend to have invented the epithet,<sup>1</sup> but he seems in a measure to imply that in his use of it for Venice he is a pioneer, and this notwithstanding the fact that the well-known ceremony of wedding the Adriatic was instituted about 1177, and that the wedding implies a maiden. He uses it in two passages<sup>2</sup> in which he brings in Venice. In the first passage he is commenting on Dort or Dordrecht:

"It is a very famous, opulent and flourishing towne, and memorable for many things, especially one above the rest which is worthy the relation. For it is called the Mayden City of Holland, (in which respect it may be as properly called Parthenopolis, as Naples is in Italie, and Maydenburg in Saxonie) and that for two causes. First, because it was built by a Maide. . . .

"Secondly, because Almighty God hath privileged this towne with such a speciall favour and prerogative, as no City or Towne that I ever read or heard of in all Christendome, saving only Venice. For it was never conquered, though all the circumjacent Cities and townes of the whole territorie of Holland have at some time or other bene expugned by the hostile force."

*Crudities*, II, 364, 365.

The other passage, which occurs earlier in Coryat's book, is the heading of the account of Venice:

"My Observations of the most glorious, peerelesse, and mayden Citie of Venice: I call it mayden, because it was never conquered."

*Crudities*, I, 301.

The obvious implication of the words, "I call it maiden," is that Coryat is taking credit for a

<sup>1</sup> We may note that J. G. Keyser, in his *Travels* (translated from the German), third edition, London, 4 vols., 1760, says, IV, 47, that he has seen "a very curious medal, struck in honour of the republic of Venice, but without any particular marks to show on what occasion it was struck." . . . The inscription reads:

"Inclitæ

Andriacæ[sic] Virgini, etc." i. e.,

"To the renowned virgin city in the Adriatic," etc.

<sup>2</sup> In another passage, I, 2, he mentions "that most glorious, renowned, and Virgin Citie of Venice, the Queene of the Christian World."

peculiarly happy phrase that he thought he had been the first—in English, at least—to apply to Venice. Of course, what is possible to one like Coryat we cannot deny to one like Wordsworth, but in any case we must admit that Coryat anticipated the poet by about three centuries.

WILLIAM EDWARD MEAD.

Wesleyan University.

### THE ORDER OF RIMES OF THE ENGLISH SONNET.

Copyright, 1910, by L. T. Weeks.

Every student of the English Sonnet, whether interested as critic or writer, has felt the need of some scheme for concentrating results of study so that they might be held before the mind. In striving for some such method, some plan that would visualize by graphic presentation the rime-order of the sonnet, I contrived the accompanying table, by means of which all the octaves and sestets used by the entire body of English sonnet writers, together with all the various individual combinations of octave with sestet, may be presented on one page. In this table appear all the octaves and sestets found in five thousand nine hundred and forty sonnets. Here one may see at a glance any and every combination of octave with sestet that occurs in the sonnets under consideration, and just how many sonnets of any particular combination have been found.

This study is intended to cover all the sonnets of representative sonnet writers from Wyatt and Surrey up to the present time. Its deductions may therefore be looked upon as fairly conclusive. It shows that thirty-five different octaves and twenty-nine different sestets have been found combined in two hundred and sixty-two ways. Other forms of octave and of sestet have been found, but here only such as occur in the work of at least two sonnet writers are set down.

If a sonnet be cast in the Petrarchan or legitimate mould, there will be but two rimes in the octave. In this study there are three thousand seven hundred and forty-six such sonnets, while there are seven hundred and eight having three,

and fourteen hundred and eighty-six having four rimes. There may, therefore, be two, three, or four rimes in the octave,—never more than four. There may be two rimes, or three, in the sestet. Now, because there may be as high as four rimes but no more in the octave, with three but never more in the sestet, the first four letters of the alphabet, always in capitals, are reserved as rime symbols for octave rimes, and the next three, *e*, *f*, *g*, always in small type, for the sestet rimes. It must be borne in mind that *C* and *D* are never used to represent sestet rimes, except where these are carried over from the octave into the sestet. Where there are but two rimes, *A* and *B*, in the octave, the first rime in the sestet is still *e* and not *C*. Where any of the octave rimes, *A*, *B*, *C*, or *D*, are carried over from the octave into the sestet, they are still printed in capitals, this being always the sign of an octave rime. In rare cases the *e* rime of the sestet is drawn forward into the octave, and is still printed a small letter.

In classifying octaves, first come those with two rimes, next those with three, and last those with four. It is probably not so well to classify sestets on the same basis, still, first place is given to those with two rimes.

These six thousand two hundred and eighty-three sonnets are taken from the works of Wyatt and Surrey, from the Elizabethan writers Spenser, Drayton, Daniel, Fletcher, Constable, Barnes, Watson, Sidney, Griffin, Lodge, Linch, and Percy, from Wordsworth, Austin, Tennyson-Turner, Lee-Hamilton, Rossetti, the DeVeres, Watts-Dunton, and many other individual writers;—also from a number of sonnet anthologies,—and, to bring this investigation strictly up to the present, from the entire number of sonnets published by three important magazines,—*The Atlantic Monthly*, *Harper's Monthly*, and *The Century Magazine*. I have also gathered from the files of *The Athenæum* of the years 1830–1850 inclusive, and 1900–1908 inclusive.

Of these six thousand two hundred and eighty-three sonnets, only five thousand nine hundred and forty are reduced to the formulas found in this table. Some of the remaining three hundred and forty-three are in blank verse, some are with more or fewer than fourteen lines, and some with the octave rime carried over into the sestet. A few of these oddities are—*ABBA ABCD-DCD*



*Cgg*, *ABAB BAAC-ACCAAA*, *ABBA ACDD-Cff Cgg*. In the years 1833, 1834, and 1836, the *Athenæum* published ten sonnets by Sir Edgerton Brydges, all of the form *ABCD ABCD-efe fgg*. The sestet of the first of these examples is in the Shakespearean form, *DCDC* answering to *efef*. The second is alone in form, while the third answers to form 14, *eff*, *egg*.

Octaves and sestets are represented individually in two ways : by numbers and by symbol letters. When the table is once mastered, the number formula is the ultimate of ease and simplicity. The first octave is *ABBA ABBA* or number 1. The first sestet is *efe fef*, or number 1. The two ways of writing and printing the formula for octave one united with sestet one, are—*ABBA ABBA-efe fef*, or 1-1. Hereafter 1-1 will always mean octave one combined with sestet one. Octave *ABBA ACCA* is 13. 13-1 means octave 13 combined with sestet 1. We are now ready for the following rule : In writing out the formula of any sonnet by symbol letters, separate the quatrains of the octave and the tercets of the sestet by spaces ; separate the octave from the sestet by a hyphen, using for octave rimes the symbols *A* and *B*, or *A*, *B*, and *C*, or *A*, *B*, *C*, and *D*, according as there are two, three, or four rimes ; and using the symbols *e*, *f*, or *e*, *f*, and *g*, for sestet rimes. In cases where the octave rime is carried over into the sestet, still represent it by its proper capital.

The formulas most in use are 1-1, 1-6, 1-7, 1-14, 1-20, 1-24, 24-20, and 33-20. The octaves most in use are 1, 13, and 33 ; the sestets most in use, 1, 20, and 24. Here we have what would seem to be an anomaly : the sestet that is far and away the favorite is the Shakespearean, *efe fgg*, ending with a couplet, contrary to the law that in the sestet "any arrangement of rimes is permissible, save that of a couplet at the close." However, this closing couplet is defended by good authority. This sestet has even been appended to three hundred and sixty-six sonnets with octave 1, and seventy-three with octave 13. On the other hand the two approved Italian types, *efe fef* and *efg efg*, have been appended to both Shakespearean and Spenserian octaves. Sonnet form 1-1 is represented by eight hundred and twenty sonnets, 1-6 by two hundred and thirty-nine,

1-7 by one hundred and seventy-one, 1-14 by one hundred and fifty-eight, 1-20 by three hundred and sixty-six, 1-24 by seven hundred and seventy-five, 24-20 by one hundred and ten, and 33-20 by twelve hundred and seventy-nine. Sestet 1 occurs nine hundred and fifty-six times, sestet 24 eight hundred and seventy-two times, and the Shakespearean sestet nineteen hundred and fifty-two times. The anomaly is that while English writers show a large loyalty to the Petrarchan octaves, they cling with pertinacity to the Shakespearean sestet. These six forms yield much more than half of the sonnets.

At the right of the table are two columns of totals. Any figure in the right hand of these columns, under the word "octaves," shows how many sonnets have been found using the octave in the margin at the left across the page. For instance, the number 3477 at the top of the column shows that octave *ABBA ABBA*, found in the margin at the left, has been used in thirty-four hundred and seventy-seven of the whole number of sonnets. In the other of these two columns, under the word "combinations," are the numbers showing how many different sestets have combined with the octave directly to the left. In this column the number 25 opposite octave 13, shows that octave 13 has combined with twenty-five of the twenty-nine sestets.

By casting the eye along the line of little squares across the page from octave 1 to 3477 on the right, the reader will see just what sestets have combined with octave 1, and, in each instance, will see just how many sonnets have been found making whatever combination is under the eye. Thus, the number 21 in the second square from the left indicates that octave 1 has been found in combination with sestet 2 twenty-one times, making combination 1-2. The footing of this column of combinations shows a total of two hundred and sixty-two differing combinations. One hundred and four of these occur but once each, forty-six occur twice, and twenty-two three times each, while only forty-six can show ten or more sonnets each to their credit, and only ten can show over one hundred each.

The large number of sonnets with form 33-20 is due in part to the fact that not a few writers use that form exclusively : Shakespeare with one

hundred and fifty-four, Jones Very with four hundred, "The Lamp of Gold" with forty-nine, etc. Notwithstanding the fact that sestet *efe fgg* has such an overwhelming number of sonnets to its credit, there are still six octaves other than the Shakespearean that give a total of more combinations each than does the Shakespearean. These octaves are 1, combining with each of the twenty-nine sestet, 3 with fifteen combinations, 8 with thirteen, 12 with fourteen, 13 with twenty-five, and 29 with eighteen. Octaves 1 and 13 make fifty-four combinations, or over twenty per cent. of the total. They occur in three thousand nine hundred and fifteen, or over 65 per cent. of the total.

The number occurring in any little square in the body of the table indicates how many times the octave directly to the left has been found in combination with the sestet directly over it. The number 820 in the upper left hand square shows that octave 1 has been found in combination with sestet 1 eight hundred and twenty times, etc.

In sixty years *Harper's Monthly* has published a total of two hundred and twenty-seven sonnets, not counting thirty-three reprinted from the sonnets of Wordsworth; in fifty-three years *The Atlantic Monthly* has published three hundred and twenty sonnets, and *The Century Magazine* four hundred and fifteen. The two Italian forms of sonnet that are followed by purists are 1-1 and 1-24. Of these, among the sonnets published in *Harper's Monthly* there are 37 per cent., almost exactly the same as the per cent. found in *The Century Magazine*, while the per cent. found in *The Atlantic Monthly* is 48.

In answer to letters of inquiry sent to various authors of sonnets in which the octave rime is carried over, I have gathered that it is often done purposely. One author says "I have striven for a music of a certain kind by running the octave rime over into the sestet." Another author confesses that this was done before the author knew the laws of the sonnet. I think it safe to believe that odd forms are oftenest mere accidents, the crudities stumbled upon by writers who, as yet, knew only that the sonnet consisted of fourteen decasyllabic iambic lines. Whittier would seem to be a case in point. He wrote eleven sonnets. Each of the first five closed with a six-stressed

line. Here some one seems to have corrected his error, for he did it no more. He has three sixteen-lined sonnets, usually runs the octave rime over, and his order of rimes is new.

Great liberty is taken, if not allowed, in the order of rimes in the English sonnet. Wordsworth leads with a variety of twenty-three octaves and twenty-two sestet in five hundred and fourteen sonnets, making one hundred and fifteen differing combinations; Aubrey de Vere makes sixty-eight combinations in three hundred and twenty-four sonnets, Rossetti sixteen in one hundred and one, H. H. nineteen in one hundred and seven, Edith M. Thomas eleven in eighty-seven, R. W. Gilder twenty-five in one hundred and one. Lloyd Mifflin has ten octaves, twenty-six sestet, and fifty-six combinations in four hundred and fifty; Louise Chandler Moulton has seventeen combinations in eighty-eight sonnets, Hartley Coleridge twenty in forty-three, Ella Wheeler Wilcox sixteen in thirty-five, Longfellow eight in sixty-eight, and Lowell thirteen in fifty-six. Of all these, Lloyd Mifflin has achieved the largest variety in sestet, and has clung to the Italian form in four hundred and four out of the four hundred and fifty sonnets.

These figures show that variety is attained by varying the sestet, rather than by varying the octave. It shows that sonnet writers rank high according as they show themselves masters of the Italian form. In the Shakespearean sonnet there is absolutely no room for variety of form, except by an occasional feminine ending. In this type, therefore, and in the Spenserian type, the writer must strive harder for variety in thought, if he is to hold the attention of his readers at all,—in the thought, the emotional content, and in beauty of rime. In reading Shakespeare's sonnets one soon finds the mind turning to these as the sources of interest. As monotonous as one may find the Ecclesiastical and River Duddon sonnets, their monotony is undoubtedly relieved by the great variety in their form. Wordsworth stands alone in using a greater variety of octave than of sestet, alone in the number of differing combinations of octave with sestet.

The Shakespearean sonnet appears less and less frequently. Wordsworth cast his first sonnet in

	setstets efe fef	2 efe efe	3 efe eef	4 efe fee	5 efe ffe	6 eff eef	7 eff efe	8 eff eef	9 eef eef	10 eef efe	11 eef eff	12 eef fef	13 eff egg	14 eff geg	15 eff gge	16 eef gfg	17 eef fgf	18 eef gff	19 eef ggf	20 efe fgg	21 efe gfg	22 efe ggf	23 eff gfg	24 efg efg	25 efg feg	26 efg egf	27 efg fge	28 efg gef	29 efg gfe	Combinations	Ocaves	
Octaves	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29			
1 ABBA ABBA	820	21	27	16	111	239	171	5	13	1	15	25	158	48	22	13	24	76	366	88	31	26	775	130	84	48	73	51	29	3477		
2 ABBA BAAB	3	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	5	2	...	...	...	...	1	2	...	...	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	8	18		
3 ABBA ABAB	9	...	...	...	2	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	8	1	1	...	7	3	...	1	2	1	15	41	
4 ABBA BABA	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	2	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	...	1	1	1	1	1	...	1	...	11	17	
5 ABBA ABAA	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	2	3	
6 ABBA BBAB	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2	
7 ABAB ABBA	3	...	...	...	3	...	6	...	eef eef	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	2	2	...	...	...	...	7	19	
8 ABAB BAAB	3	...	...	...	2	2	3	...	...	...	...	...	11	2	...	...	...	...	...	4	...	...	...	4	1	3	1	2	3	13	41	
9 ABAB AABB	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	2	
10 ABAB AABA	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	3	
11 ABAB ABAB	11	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	...	...	...	...	5	26	2	...	...	...	5	34	2	1	...	2	...	1	...	...	11	93		
12 ABAB BABA	5	...	...	...	1	1	3	...	...	...	1	2	2	1	2	...	...	...	3	7	1	...	...	1	1	...	...	1	14	30		
13 ABBA ACCA	50	1	1	...	19	13	25	2	...	1	..	2	67	9	4	1	1	16	73	15	15	5	49	16	24	11	12	6	25	438		
14 ABBA CAAC	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	3	
15 ABBA ACAC	3	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	5	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	6	14		
16 ABBA CACA	1	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	5	9	
17 ABAB ACCA	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	3	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	7	9	
18 ABAB ACAC	4	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	3	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	6	11	
19 ABAB CACA	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	3	
20 ABBA BCCB	2	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	2	...	...	...	...	4	7	
21 ABBA CBBC	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	...	1	2	...	...	1	...	8	10	
22 ABBA CBCB	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	3	6	
23 ABAB BCCB	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	1	...	...	2	1	...	2	...	8	16		
24 ABAB BCBC	26	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	8	...	1	...	...	...	...	110	5	1	...	4	...	1	...	1	9	157		
25 ABAB CBCB	...	1	...	5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2	...	...	...	...	...	4	...	1	...	...	2	...	...	...	7	15		
26 ABAB CCBC	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	3		
27 ABBA ACCB	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	3		
28 ABBC CBBA	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2	2	
29 ABBA CDDC	4	1	...	6	3	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	59	1	1	...	1	4	24	7	1	...	8	3	3	1	...	1	18	131		
30 ABBC CDDA	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	3	3	
31 ABAB CDDC	...	...	...	...	2	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	8	...	...	...	2	...	...	1	...	6	18		
32 AABB CCDD	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	18	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	19		
33 ABAB CDCD	7	2	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	3	...	1	2	1279	...	...	...	...	5	1	...	...	...	1	11	1306		
34 ABAB CCDD	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	4		
35 ABBA CDCD	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	4	5		
Total sestets....	956	29	28	28	147	266	213	9	17	4	16	35	342	97	32	35	27	110	1952	127	52	33	872	165	121	65	93	67		5940		
Total number of combinations of octave with sestet,																														262		
																																12
Sonnets in blank verse,																																140
Sonnets with octave rime carried over into sestet,																																2
Sonnets with four-stressed lines (S. T. Coleridge and H. H.),																																60
Ten-lined sonnets from "Laura," 1594,																																60
Twelve-lined sonnets from "Laura," 1594,																																6
Thirteen-lined sonnets,																																9
Fifteen-lined sonnets,																																50
Sixteen-lined sonnets,																																4
Eighteen-lined sonnets,																																6283
Total number of sonnets studied in this paper,																																



that mould, and used it no more. On the other hand, the favorite Italian forms, 1-1 and 1-24 become constantly more common. Of these two types 1-1 was far more common fifty years ago than was 1-24. Now 1-24 is more common, and bids fair to outstrip its rival. William Sharp gives 1-24 as the preferred form. With the exception of Wordsworth it will be found that sonnet writers have shown more variety in their early efforts than in their later, proving that as they became more conscious of sonnet laws, they turned more to the legitimate forms. Longfellow gave us his variety of eight forms in his first ten sonnets. Fifty-one of the last fifty-eight are of type 1-24, five are 1-1, and a lone translation from the French breaks the regularity. The same is true of the magazines quoted above: In the first nine volumes of the three magazines, *Harper's Monthly*, *The Atlantic Monthly*, and *The Century Magazine*, there appeared fourteen sonnets of type 1-1 to nine of type 1-24. In the last ten volumes of these magazines there were published thirty-two sonnets of type 1-24 to fifteen of 1-1. In the last ten years *The Athenæum* has published only sonnets with the Italian octave.

It is one of the experiences of history that when Christopher Sly has knocked off the necks of a few cobwebby bottles of old wine, he ceases to order "a pot o' the smallest ale." His ability to discriminate becomes cumulative. There are at present a host of writers pouring sonnets of all grades into the channels of literature. As a result the reading public, from the Slys picked up on the heath to the artistic nature with the finest taste, is becoming ever more critical, forcing the author to be constantly more assiduous and careful in his polishing, and the editor to be more strict in his selections. The result is that variety in the octave is disappearing. In the last ten years only the legitimate octave has appeared in *The Athenæum*; *The Atlantic Monthly* has departed from it in only three instances, with two Shakespearean sonnets, and one with octave 29; *Harper's Monthly* has departed in two Shakespearean sonnets and eight various forms; *The Century Magazine* in five Shakespearean sonnets and ten other forms.

L. T. WEEKS.

#### SOUTHEY AND A REVIEWAL.

It will probably be of interest to students of Southey to have set forth the following evidence, pointing to his authorship of an article in the *Critical Review*, Vol. xxxii, pp. 513 f. (1801), with the following title: "Mexico Conquistada: Poema Heroyco, etc., Mexico Conquered: An Heroic Poem. By Don Juan de Escoiquez, Canon of Zaragoza, &c., in 3 volumes."

The reasons that may be adduced to show that Southey wrote this review are these: First, There were few English-speaking persons who were well enough acquainted with Spanish literature at the beginning of the nineteenth century to review a poem in that language of any considerable length.

Second, Southey was well acquainted with Spanish literature, as is shown by his translations of certain Spanish poems, printed in his *Letters Written During a Short Residence in Spain and Portugal* (1797), and by the frequent use and citations of Spanish authors in the *Madoc* (1805, but practically completed by 1799).

Third, The reviewer shows familiarity with Camoens, Ercilla y Zuñiga,<sup>1</sup> Lope de Vega,<sup>2</sup> and Christoval de Mesa,<sup>3</sup> with all whom Southey was well acquainted, as may be seen by references given below.

Fourth, Our reviewer affirms (p. 520), "Escoiquez has never profited by the costume of the Mexicans; his pictures are mere outlines, like the rude paintings of the people whom he describes." Southey did make abundant use of Mexican costume in his *Madoc*.<sup>4</sup>

Fifth, The reviewer pronounces this dictum in regard to the availability of Mexican history, for

<sup>1</sup> Southey has seventeen references—quotations or other—from *La Araucana* of Ercilla y Zuñiga; see Southey's *Common Place Book*, II, pp. 231, 528, 529; IV, pp. 16, 630; also Southey's own edition of his *Poet. Works*, v, p. 434.

<sup>2</sup> See *Poet. Works*, I, pp. 241, 295, 298, 299; IX, 269, 271, 294, 323-5, 327; *Common Place Book*, II, pp. 273-4; IV, pp. 271, 495, 544, 606. See also *Crit. Review*, XXXII, p. 520.

<sup>3</sup> See *Poet. Works*, VII, pp. 269, 278-9, 294; IX, 338-40, 364; *Common Place Book*, II, 292; cf. *Crit. Review*, XXXII, p. 520.

<sup>4</sup> See *Poet. Works*, v, pp. 55, 56, 279, 280, 282, 283, *passim*.



epic (p. 513), "No action ancient or modern, presents so splendid a subject to the epic poet as the Conquest of Mexico. The means are great and surprising, the end of adequate importance; the scene offers whatever is beautiful in painting; the costume is new and striking; the superstition is strange and terrible," etc. Whoever the author of the foregoing criticism may have been, we know that Southey, in his *Madoc*,<sup>4</sup> made use of the very materials so conspicuously absent in the *Mexico Conquistada*.

In addition to what has just been offered, it is worthy of remark that the author of the review in question is hostile to the Roman Catholic church, saying (p. 513): "The Catholic cares not upon what ruins the temple of his great goddess is erected. The priests of Tezcalipoca were succeeded by bigots not less barbarous, and the more atrocious rites of St. Dominic." One needs to read only a few pages of Southey's prose and but little more of his poetry to discover that he was a vigorous opponent of the Roman Catholic church.<sup>5</sup>

Finally, in discussing a certain incident in the poem—the return of Jeronimo de Aguilar from captive slavery among the Mexicans—our reviewer draws a comparison between the epic account in the poem and the account of the same incident in "an old historian," along with which he gives a quotation in English from this historian. What the name of the historian is, we are not told, but we are given this account as follows: (the occasion is the arrival of Aguilar at the camp of Cortez) "and he began to speak in the Spanish tongue in this wise, 'Masters, are ye Christians?' 'Yea,' quoth they, 'and of the Spanish nation.' Then he rejoiced so much that the tears fell from his eyes, and demanded of them what day it was, although he had a Primer wherein he daily prayed. He besought them earnestly to assist him with their prayers and thanksgiving to God for his delivery; and kneeling devoutly down upon his knees, holding up his hands, his eyes toward heaven, and his face bathed with tears, he made his humble prayer unto God, giving most hearty thanks that it had pleased him to deliver him out of the power of

infidels and infernal creatures, and to place him among Christians and men of his own nation." Who is the author, and what is the work quoted from? By referring to Southey's *Common Place Book* II, p. 529, we find the following: "And then he began to speake in the Spanish tongue in thys wise, 'Maisters, are ye Christians?' 'Yea,' quoth they, 'and of the Spanish nation.' Then he rejoiced so much, that the teares fell from his eyes, and demaunded of them what day it was, although he had a Primer wherein he dayly prayed. He then besought them earnestlye to assist him with their prayers and thanksgiving unto God for his delivery, and kneling devoutly downe uppon his knees, holding up his handes, his eyes toward heaven, and his face bathed with teares, made his most humble prayer unto God, giving most heartie thanks, that it hadde pleased hym to deliver him out of the power of Infidels and infernal creatures, and to place hym among Christians and men of his owne nation."— . . . *The Pleasant Historie of the Weast India*.<sup>6</sup>

From the preceding evidence, we may with little doubt credit Southey with the authorship of the review as above entitled, and may therefore be assured that the author of the *Madoc* was acquainted with a poem in the Spanish language which dealt with the same great theme that Southey used in his poem.

CHRISTOPHER LONGEST.

University of Mississippi.

#### PLUTARCH AND DEAN SWIFT.

An interesting and hitherto unnoticed parallel to Swift's *Voyage to the Houyhnhnms*, which forms the fourth part of *Gulliver's Travels*, is to be found in Plutarch's "Gryllus,"<sup>1</sup> a dialogue between Ulysses and one of Circe's swine, in

<sup>6</sup> For the complete title of this translation of Gómara's history, see *Common Place Book*, II, p. 570.

<sup>1</sup> Περὶ τοῦ τὰ ἀλογαλόγῳ χρῆσθαι. *Plutarchi Moralia*, ed. G. Bernardakis, Lips., 1891, VI, p. 82.

*Plutarch's Morals*. Translated from the Greek by several hands. Corrected and revised by William W. Goodwin. Boston, 1870. Vol. IV. I have quoted from and referred to this translation.

<sup>5</sup> See especially *Letters Written During a Short Residence in Spain and Portugal*, pp. 74, 76, 132; also *Essays, Moral and Political*, by Robert Southey, vol. II, p. 280.

which the manners and morals of the human species are satirically contrasted with those of brutes. The piece can in no sense be called a forerunner of *Gulliver*; nor is there conclusive evidence that it furnished Swift with any of those numerous hints which the candid Dean "was never known to steal." There are, however, resemblances between the two works, not only in general idea but in detail, which make it seem at least quite possible, considering Swift's fondness for the highways and byways of late classical literature, that he had read this dialogue of Plutarch's and been influenced by it in writing the last part of his great satire.

In externals the two satires have little or nothing in common. There is in Plutarch no caricature of humanity to correspond with the loathsome Yahoos; and in place of an imaginary journey to a land of reasoning and speaking brutes, by association with whom the traveller discovers how ignoble and degraded human nature really is, we have in the Greek work a philosophic discussion between the wisest and most reasonable of men and a creature who has been transformed from man's estate and knows by experience, how much preferable is the life of a brute to that of a man. The satire on humanity, which in Swift is largely conveyed by innuendo, is in Plutarch explicit and direct. There is, moreover, a slight difference of emphasis in the two works, Swift's avowed object being "to degrade humanity to the level of the brute and even to elevate the brute above man," Plutarch's rather to win greater respect for brute creation by contrasting the virtues of animals with the vices of man, and to show how ill justified is his complacent assumption of superiority. But the Greek writer is led away from his ostensible purpose to indulge, like Swift, though in a milder mood, in a general satire on human nature, putting the indictment against mankind into the mouth of a reasoning beast who makes a damaging point by point comparison of the irrational and vicious ways of civilized man with the purer and saner lives of the despised lower animals.

In Plutarch's dialogue Ulysses, pitying the condition of his changed companions, asks Circe to allow him to restore them to their proper shapes, but finds on inquiry that they are quite contented

with their lot. One of their number, Gryllus, becomes spokesman for the rest and informs the astonished Greek that it is he who is to be pitied and despised because he is afraid to be changed from a worse state to a better. In answer to Ulysses's remonstrance, Gryllus undertakes to prove that mankind is inferior to brute creation in each of the virtues of which he is so proud, as justice, prudence, fortitude, etc.<sup>2</sup>

Considering first the virtue of fortitude, Gryllus contrasts the underhanded methods by which Ulysses makes war with the fairer and simpler ones of animals. "Thou dost only circumvent by tricks and artifices men that understand only the simple and generous way of making war, ignorant altogether of fraud and faith breaking. . . . But do you observe the combats and warfare of beasts, as well against another as against yourselves, how free from craft and deceit they are, and how with an open and naked courage they defend themselves by mere strength of body." We are reminded of Gulliver's description of the art of war as practiced by mankind (*Gulliver's Travels*, Pt. iv, Ch. v), and later (Ch. vii) of the satirical allusion to a Yahoo battle, in which the horrible creatures inflicted wounds with their claws but are seldom able to kill each other, "for want of such convenient instruments of death as we have invented."

Gryllus next comments on the fact that the females of brute creation are little inferior in strength and courage to the males and bear their burden of toil and battle, while women are weaklings and cowards. He refers among other illustrations to the horse. "Your king also took the mare Aetha from the Sicynian, as a bribe to discharge him from going to the wars; and he did well, thereby showing how much he esteemed a valiant and generous mare above a timorous coward."<sup>3</sup> Among the Houyhnhms, it will be remembered, the education of both sexes is alike; and "his Honor" expresses the opinion that the human system, whereby one-half of mankind is good for nothing but bringing children into the world, is monstrous.

Passing now to the virtue of temperance, Gryllus satirizes the avarice of men, contrasting his

<sup>2</sup> Plut., Ch. iv.

<sup>3</sup> Plut., Ch. iv.

own present scorn of wealth and all it can buy with his former greed.<sup>4</sup> So in the *Voyage to the Houyhnhnms* Gulliver (Ch. VI) is at much pains to describe to his master the use of money to procure luxuries for men and the eagerness with which it is sought by the human Yahoos.

More striking is the resemblance between the two satires in the comparison which is drawn in each of men and beasts with regard to the relation of the sexes. Brutes, says Gryllus, are temperate and natural in their sexual desires; they attract each other by their own proper scents, without the use of artificial perfumes by either sex, and "the females without the coyness of women or the practice of little frauds and fascinations." (Ch. VII.) In like manner Gulliver tells of the restraint of the Houyhnhnms as compared with the incontinence of the Yahoos, and refers particularly to the wiles of the female of the latter race. (*Gulliver*, Pt. IV, Ch. VII.) In both works there is a reference to unnatural practices, explicit in Plutarch (Ch. VII) and politely hinted at by Swift. (Ch. VII.)

Gryllus now considers the matter of diet, contrasting the voracity of men and their consequent ill health with the greater temperance of beasts. "You pursue the pleasures of eating and drinking beyond the satisfaction of nature, and are punished with many and tedious diseases." Animals confine themselves to a single article of diet while man eats all.<sup>5</sup> In Gulliver the contrast which is expressly drawn by Plutarch is as usual more subtly conveyed by Swift. After describing the process by which he prepared his oaten cakes, Gulliver remarks<sup>6</sup>: "It was at first a very insipid diet, though common enough in many parts of Europe, but grew tolerable by time and having been often enough reduced to hard fare in my life, this was the first experiment I had made how easily nature is satisfied. And I cannot but observe, that I never had one hour's sickness, while I stayed in this island."

The race of beasts, says Gryllus, have shown their prudence by admitting no vain and unprofitable arts. "Neither do they make it their study to fasten one contemplation to another, but they are supplied by their own prudence with such as

are true born and genuine." They know by nature how to cure themselves when they are sick; "neither are some of them ignorant how to teach the science of music so far as is convenient for them." Nature being their schoolmistress, they derive their prudence from the "chiefest and wisest original of understanding"; "which if you think not proper to call reason and wisdom, it is time for ye to find out a more glorious and honorable name for it." The Houyhnhnms, while equally ignorant of speculation and of the elaborate arts of civilization, are marvellously dexterous in the use of "the hollow part between the pastern and the hoof"; (Ch. IX.) they "excell all other mortals" in poetry; and though they are subject to no diseases and hence need no physicians, yet they have "excellent medicines composed of herbs" to cure their accidental hurts.

After Gryllus has made one or two more telling hits at man, Ulysses, as a last resort, bids him hesitate to ascribe reason to those who have no knowledge of a deity. The swine begins, with some heat, to discuss, apparently, the question of religion; but here the dialogue breaks off. Whether or not the wily Ulysses finally acknowledges himself convinced we do not learn.

In considering the probability of Swift's having derived suggestions from Plutarch's work we must admit at once that the parallels quoted above might easily be the result of accident, given the similarity of the two pieces in their fundamental conception. The resemblances are in no case so striking as to warrant the conclusion that Swift used this previous comparison to help out his own amply sufficient ingenuity. We must also take into account the fact that the Dean certainly seems to be indebted for some things in the *Voyage to the Houyhnhnms* to a work from which he also borrowed hints for the earlier parts of Gulliver, viz., Cyrano de Bergerac's *Voyage Comique*.<sup>7</sup>

The moon-men in the first part of Cyrano's work go on all fours, and they refuse to admit that Cyrano is a reasonable creature, just as the

<sup>4</sup> Plut., Ch. VI.

<sup>5</sup> Plut., Ch. VIII.

<sup>6</sup> *Gulliver's Travels*, Pt. IV, Ch. II.

<sup>7</sup> *Oeuvres de Cyrano de Bergerac, precedees d'une notice par Le Blanc*, Paris, 1856. For studies of the sources of *Gulliver's Travels*, see *Anglia*, x, 397 ff., xv, 345 ff.; also an article by Max Poll, "The Sources of Gulliver's Travels," *University of Cincinnati Bulletin*, Ser. II, Vol. 3, No. 24.



Houyhnhnms cannot credit the reason of mankind. Like the Houyhnhnms they speak a musical language, depend solely on their own reason, and detest falsehood. Moreover, in the last part of the *Voyage Comique* Cyrano finds himself in the land of birds and is arraigned by them on various charges; his accusers refuse to admit that he is a reasonable creature like themselves; they comment with scorn upon his bodily shape; and charge him above all with belonging to the hated race of mankind, their wanton slayers. Like Gulliver in the council of the Houyhnhnms, he is condemned.

For the suggestion of the general plan of the *Voyage to the Houyhnhnms*,—i. e. the fiction of an imaginary journey to a land of animals,—Swift is probably indebted to the French work. He almost certainly owes to Cyrano the idea which underlies all of *Gulliver's Travels*, of using a fabulous voyage among alien beings as a vehicle for satire. It is to be observed, however, that there is in Cyrano's work no point by point contrast of the ways of brutes with the ways of men, nor any attempt to exalt the virtues of brute creation. No point is made in the "Plaidoirie des Oiseaux" of the excellences of the feathered tribe. The proposition that man's boast of superiority over animals is unfounded, which underlies the satire of Swift and Plutarch, finds no place in the *Voyage Comique*. Finally, the satire against humanity in Cyrano's work hardly touches moral issues at all, but concerns itself chiefly with external and accidental matters, like the wearing of clothes. Is it not therefore quite possible that the particular direction which the satire takes in the fourth part of *Gulliver's Travels* was determined by Plutarch's dialogue, and that Swift derived from the same source the suggestion for some of the individual points which he makes in the course of his comparison of the manners of the Houyhnhnms with those of the Yahoos and of mankind?

That Swift had read the dialogue seems highly probable. He speaks in the *Journal to Stella* (Jan. 12, 1712-13) of having bought a two volume Plutarch for thirty shillings, and he shows throughout his writings an acquaintance not only with Plutarch's *Lives* but with his minor works

as well.<sup>8</sup> The name and story of "Gryllus" were familiar to English readers from the passage about him at the close of Book II of the *Faerie Queen*, and from not infrequent later references.<sup>9</sup>

JAMES HOLLY HANFORD.

Simmons College.

## NOTES TO THE DON QUIJOTE.

In Part II, Chap. xli, Don Quijote says:

"Si mal no me acuerdo, yo he leído en Virgilio aquello del Paladion de Troya, que fué un caballo de madera que los griegos presentaron á la Diosa Palas, el cual iba preñado de caballeros armados que después fueron la total ruina de Troya; etc."<sup>1</sup>

It is obvious that the good knight is here confusing the horse of Troy with the Palladium, the image sacred to Pallas. The mistake was natural as the horse was alleged by the Greeks to be a votive offering to Pallas to appease that goddess for the wrong done her in stealing the Palladium from her temple. So far as I know, this mistake has been noticed by none of the commentators, although it must have impressed many a reader. Even Bowle, accomplished student of the classics

<sup>8</sup> See "A Discourse on the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit," Bohn Lib. ed. of Swift, I, 206 (cf. "Plutarch De Iside et Osiride"); *Examiner*, No. 35, Mch. 22, 1711; "Mr. Collins Discourse on Free Thinking," Bohn Lib. ed., III, 186 (cf. "Plutarch De Superstitione"), etc. In the poem *Cadenus and Vanessa*, Swift says that he warded off the shafts of Cupid from Vanessa's heart by placing some book between.

"The darts were in the cover fix'd

Or, often blunted and recoil'd,

On Plutarch's morals struck, were spoiled."

<sup>9</sup> *F. Q.*, Bk. II, stanzas 86 and 87: My attention was called to this reference by Professor Kittredge. Cf. also Joseph Hall, *Satires*, Book II, Sat. 2; and Phineas Fletcher, *The Purple Island*, VII. Thomas Warton (*Observations on the Faerie Queen*, ed. of 1807, II, 164), remarks that Giovanni Battista Gelli's *Circe*, published in 1548 and translated into English by Henry Iden, is stated in the preface to be founded on this dialogue of Plutarch's.

<sup>1</sup> Cervantes, *Don Quijote* (ed. Clemencin, Madrid, 1836), Vol. v, p. 324.



though he was, failed to notice it, and Clemencín has nothing better to offer. I desire to present a number of instances showing how widespread this error was in Spanish literature, for this is not a mistake of which Cervantes alone was guilty. A large number of his contemporaries fell into the same error.

Cervantes's continuator, the mysterious Avellaneda, was no better informed than Cervantes himself as is shown by the following passage:

"... el cual es que hagamos un *paladion* ó un caballo grande de bronce, y que metamos en él todos los hombres armados que pudiéremos, y le dejemos en este campo con solo Sinón, etc."<sup>2</sup>

Lobo Laso de la Vega in his *romance* entitled *El caballo de Troya*, says:

Sobre la más alta almena  
De la troyana muralla  
El *Paladion* de los griegos  
Tendida tiene la barba.  
De un belicoso escuadron  
La máquina está preñada  
Que con solícitos vistos  
El daño común prepara.<sup>3</sup>

Compare also Tirso de Molina, *La vida de Herodes*:

Basta: que en Palestina  
Tambien nacen Sinones  
Que ofrezcan entre enredos  
A Troya *Paladiones*.<sup>4</sup>

Several instances are to be found in Calderón. In his *Troya abrasada* (a play which he wrote in collaboration with Juan de Zabaleta and which I intend soon to publish), the horse is frequently called the *paladion*, *e. g.*:

que él [Menelao] de su parte pondria  
boluntad y rrendimiento,  
en cuya fee dara á Palas  
por su fiadora, ofreciendo  
al Ylion de sus muros,  
donde está su altibo templo,  
vn fabricado caballo  
que estaba su jente haciendo  
para consagrarle á Marte  
jeroglífico perfeto

<sup>2</sup> Avellaneda, *Don Quijote*, in *Novelistas posteriores á Cervantes* (Madrid, 1851), p. 24a.

<sup>3</sup> Durán, *Romancero general* (Madrid, 1849), No. 477, p. 321.

<sup>4</sup> Tirso de Molina, *Comedias* (ed. Cotarelo y Mori), Vol. II, p. 188b.

de la guerra; y así á Palas  
le ofrecieran, adquiriendo  
nombre de *Paladion*  
por su nombre en efeto.

Calderón occasionally uses the word *paladion* as synonymous with *caballo*, just as he uses the word *hipógrifo*. He never tires of comparing a ship to a horse or a horse to a ship.<sup>5</sup> Here are two instances where he uses *paladion* referring to ships. The first instance is from *El segundo Scipion*:

Ya veo que  
Es cada bajel de aquellos  
Marino *paladion*  
Que de su preñado seno  
Aborta gentes, etc.<sup>6</sup>

The second is from *Polifemo y Circe*:

¿ Aquel que *paladion*  
De las ondas inclementes,  
Hombres á la tierra aborta  
Desde su preñado vientre?<sup>7</sup>

One more reference, this time from *La gran Cenobia*:

Traigan máquinas de fuego  
Más que ingeniero traidor,  
Sobre los muros de Troya  
Dispuso en el *Paladion*.<sup>8</sup>

Vélez de Guevara's *Diablo cojuelo* furnishes another instance. In a burlesque description of a play called the *Troya abrasada* and which I have good reason to believe to be the same as the Calderón-Zabaleta play referred to, the *Paladion* is mentioned as one of the stage properties:

Sale lo primero por el patio, sin auer cantado,  
el *Paladion* con quatro mil Griegos por lo menos,  
armados de punta en blanco, dentro del.<sup>9</sup>

Moreto, too, uses the word in the same way in *Las travesuras de Pantoja*:

Mas digo, ¿ he de ser robada  
Tambien del *paladion*  
Guijarrista, ese troton  
Caballo?<sup>10</sup>

<sup>5</sup> All references to dramatic authors are to the Rivadeneira editions unless otherwise indicated. Cf. *La puente de Mantible*, Vol. I, p. 222a; *Los tres mayores prodigios*, Vol. I, p. 286a; *Argenis y Poliarco*, Vol. I, p. 441a; *Fieras afemina amor*, Vol. II, p. 545c.

<sup>6</sup> Vol. IV, p. 344a.

<sup>7</sup> Vol. IV, p. 423b.

<sup>8</sup> Vol. I, p. 192b.

<sup>9</sup> Vélez de Guevara, *El diablo cojuelo* (ed. Bonilla y San Martín, Madrid, 1910), p. 41.

<sup>10</sup> Moreto, *Las travesuras de Pantoja*, p. 401c.

Cristóbal Monroy y Silva makes the same error in his play entitled *La destruccion de Troya*.<sup>11</sup> So do Guillén de Castro and Mira de Amescua in the third act of their play called *La manzana de la discordia y robo de Elena*. I have also found it in that curious work by Pero López de Haro called *La antigua, memorable y sangrienta destruccion de Troya*.<sup>12</sup> I know of no instance of it in any of the Troy versions based directly upon Dares, Dictys, Benoit de Sainte-More or Guido delle Colonne. Delgado, for example, in his widely read work, the *Cronica troyana*,<sup>13</sup> uses the term *paladion* correctly. And, more striking still, Cristóbal Monroy y Silva, who, as has been seen, used the word as synonymous with *caballo* in his play, nevertheless used it correctly in his more serious work, the *Epitome de la historia de Troya*. This is how he there defines the word:

Troya no podia ser vencida mientras tuviera dentro el Paladion, que era un madero dorado que estava en el Templo de Minerva y la Diosa se le avia dado a los Troyanos, prometiendoles que no seria destruyda Troya en tanto que le tuviera en ella.<sup>14</sup>

The wide prevalence of an error like the one just discussed, goes to show how little direct acquaintance with the classics many of the Spanish poets of the time possessed. It may be significant that I have been unable to find an instance of the mistake in Lope de Vega, although he alludes to the horse of Troy frequently. It also affords one more proof of how freely the wits borrowed from each other. No sooner was a new trope invented than it was used by everybody and speedily became threadbare. It would be interesting to know whether the mistake has a more remote origin.

In a recent number of the *Athenæum*,<sup>15</sup> Mr. Robinson Smith, an American scholar who is soon

to publish a new translation of the *Don Quijote*, attempts to fix more precisely than has yet been done the dates of the writing of the two parts of the novel. Mr. Smith can hardly be said to have proven his point, although he himself considers his evidence "absolute." He bases his case on the often noted similarity of the passage in Part I, Chap. xvii, where Sancho is said to have been blanketed like a dog at Shrovetide, and the similar one in *Guzmán de Alfarache*, Part I, Book iii, Chap. i. He concludes that chapter seventeen at least must have been written as late or later than 1599. This may well have been the case, but the fact is by no means proven. In the first place, Mr. Smith fails to recognize that Cervantes may have seen Alemán's work in the manuscript just as Lope de Vega is thought to have seen the *Don Quijote* before its publication. As is well known, in Chap. xxii there is a possible allusion to the then unpublished second part of *Guzmán de Alfarache*, although this troublesome point has never been definitely settled.<sup>16</sup> Neither is it certain, in spite of similarity of verbiage, that Cervantes was borrowing from Alemán in the passage referred to. Both authors were realists describing he popular life and customs about them. It does not necessarily imply borrowing when two authors allude to such common customs as the torturing of dogs at Shrovetide or the blanketing of a *pícaro*. There is an allusion to the Shrovetide dog in Lope de Vega, *El premio de bien hablar*:

¿Qué galgo con cencerro ó con guitarra,  
Sacudiendo la cola, huyendo vino  
Por las Carnestolendas, como salgo?<sup>17</sup>

This citation proves nothing but it is evidently an independent allusion to the same popular custom. Clemencín says such allusions are common.<sup>18</sup> Two of Calderón's *graciosos* are tossed in blankets.<sup>19</sup> This may, of course, be due to the influence of one or other of the two novels referred to, yet there is nothing in the context to indicate that

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the *suelta* edition of Valencia, 1768, p. 20.

<sup>12</sup> Toledo, 1583.

<sup>13</sup> *Cronica troyana, en que se contiene la total y lamentable destruccion de la nombrada Troya* (Medina, 1587).

<sup>14</sup> *Epitome de la historia de Troya, su fenacion, y Ruina con un discurso apologetico en defensa de su verdad. Por don Cristoval de Monroy y Silva, Teniente de la real fortaleza de la ilustre y antigua villa de Alcala de Guadaire su patria, año 1641. Impresso con licencia en Sevilla por Francisco de Lyra. Folio 25, recto.*

<sup>15</sup> No. 4269, Aug. 21, 1909, pp. 211-13.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *Don Quijote* (ed. Clemencín), Vol. II, pp. 210-11; and Ormsby's note to the same passage, *Don Quijote* (translated by Ormsby, New York, 1901), Vol. I, p. 407.

<sup>17</sup> Vol. I, p. 493b.

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 57.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *Lances de amor y fortuna*, Vol. I, p. 52a, and *La señora y la criada*, Vol. II, p. 45c. The operation is in both cases performed, not by *pícaros* but by pages. The custom must have been exceedingly common then as now.

such is the case. I believe that Fitzmaurice-Kelly is right in minimizing the importance of the passage in Mateo Alemán and that it affords too uncertain a basis for determining the date of the *Don Quijote*.<sup>20</sup> The additional reasons adduced by Mr. Smith are, if anything, even less plausible.

In Part II, Chap. x, Don Quijote rebukes Sancho for saying *cananeas* instead of *hacaneas*. Clemencín quotes the *Filosofía poética* of Alonso López Pinciano, who mentions this same error of speech as an example of crass and ridiculous ignorance. In this connection, it is worth noting that Sancho's mistake is in the nature of a popular etymology. The word *cananea* was familiar to all Spaniards by reason of the frequency of the pious ejaculation: *Válgame la Cananea*. Tirso de Molina puts this expression into the mouth of the *gracioso* Catalinón, who, when he rescues his master, Don Juan Tenorio from shipwreck by carrying him ashore in his arms, exclaims:

¡ Válgame la Cananea  
y qué salado está el mar! <sup>21</sup>

The allusion is to the Cananite woman (*Matthew* 15: 22-8), who was looked upon as the exponent of patience and faith. The exclamation indicates that one's patience is all but exhausted. The confusion of *Cananea* and *hacanea* was doubtless a widely current vulgarism. A commentator is always tempted to read into his author more than is really there, but there possibly is lurking in the passage in question a play upon words which has escaped the modern reader. Sancho replies: *Poca diferencia hay de cananeas á hacaneas*. This may mean that the hackney, which was a gentle, long-suffering mount, especially intended for ladies, had the patience of the Cananite.

Dulcinea's real name was Aldonza Lorenzo. Is there any significance in the choice of the name Aldonza? It may have been chosen with reference to the proverb: *A falta de moza buena es Aldonza*. Aldonza had come to be almost exclu-

sively a peasant name. The fact that Covarrubias takes the trouble to assure his readers that ladies of high rank had borne it only goes to show that such was not often the case in his day. The name had become as plebeian as Menga, Antón, or Gil. Tirso in his *Pretendiente al revés*, uses it as a conventional peasant name:

Pero Gil amaba á Menga  
Desde el día que en la boda  
De Mingollo el porquerizo  
Lo vió bailar con Aldonza.<sup>22</sup>

The proverb may mean, then, if you cannot find a young and attractive partner, a peasant wench is better than none at all. Aldonza was thus proverbially a *pis-aller*, a sweetheart chosen for want of a better. The application is obvious. There is, however, one important difficulty in the way of accepting this explanation. Inasmuch as Aldonza is contrasted with *moza*, the Aldonza of the proverb would seem to be an aged peasant woman. Like so many other proverbs, this seems to go back to some popular anecdote now lost. In such matters, contemporaries are better judges than moderns, and Juan de Malara, in his quaint gloss to this proverb, understands that Aldonza is an old woman.<sup>23</sup> Now, Dulcinea's lack of charm was not due to years. From the first, Cervantes describes her as a "*moza labradora*." The choice of the name, then, may have been determined by the proverb but it seems more likely that he chose it merely as a typical peasant name. Bowle has already cited the proverb in this connection, but he does not discuss the point and apparently quotes the proverb merely as an example of the use of the name Aldonza.<sup>24</sup>

It has been suggested that a connection exists between the name and character of Sancho and the two proverbs: *Al buen callar llaman Sancho*, and *Allá va Sancho con su rocín*.<sup>25</sup> In the latter case, it is hardly likely that the proverb determined the choice of the name but rather, if there be any connection at all, that the proverbs sug-

<sup>20</sup> P. 42c.

<sup>21</sup> Juan de Malara, *La filosofía vulgar* (Madrid, 1618), pp. 229 verso and 230 recto.

<sup>22</sup> *Don Quijote* (ed. Bowle, Salisbury, 1781), Vol. III, p. 12.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Cejador, *La lengua de Cervantes* (Madrid, 1906), under the word Sancho.

<sup>24</sup> Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *Chapters on Spanish Literature* (London, 1908), pp. 148 f.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Tirso, *El burlador de Sevilla* (ed. Cotarelo y Mori), Vol. II, p. 629a; also *Tan largo me lo fiais*, *Ibid.*, p. 661a.

gested the traits of character to be bestowed upon the bearer of the name. The character of Sancho was developed so slowly that the name was undoubtedly chosen before the author had decided what to make of the character.

*Una olla de algo más vaca que carnero* (Part I, Chap. 1), is a phrase which offers difficulty and which has never been sufficiently elucidated by the commentators. Bowle pointed out that it contains a reference to the proverb: *Vaca y carnero, olla de caballero*.<sup>26</sup> According to Anglo-Saxon notions, beef and mutton are not bad fare. Hence, the proverb would appear to refer to the good cheer enjoyed by gentlemen. The reverse is true. *Ternera* and *cordero* might have been considered passable, but there are only too many allusions in contemporary literature showing the slight esteem in which beef was held by Spaniards. The proverb is probably a jibe at the parsimonious diet of the poor hidalgo of the time. An *olla* thus composed was only slightly better than the *salpicon*, *duelos* y *quebrantos* and *lentejas* which formed the other staples of Don Quijote's larder. Lope de Vega's Juan Labrador was better off, as in addition to the *vaca* and *carnero*, his *olla* contained a *gallina*.<sup>27</sup> But Juan Labrador was a prosperous villano and could afford the luxury. The best Don Quijote could treat himself to was a pigeon on Sunday. The popular saws give information as to the proper ingredients of an *olla*: *La olla sin verdura no tiene gracia ni hartura*; and *Ni olla sin tocino ni boda sin tamborino*. Only the tongue and feet of a lean cow were thought desirable. *De la vaca flaca, la lengua y la pata*. Of the two ingredients, *vaca* was less esteemed than *carnero*, and, by the phrase in question, Cervantes is poking fun at his hero's humble fare. It does not merely mean that beef was commoner than mutton, as Ormsby thought.

One of Tirso's *gracioso*s in *La huerta de Juan Fernández* says that heaven has provided two kinds of food, one for the gentleman, another for the poor working-man and ends:

Pues ¿por qué ¡cuerpo de tal!  
Si hizo el cielo distinction  
Del abadejo y salmon,  
No comerá el oficial

<sup>26</sup> Bowle, *Ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>27</sup> *El villano en su rincón*, Vol. II, p. 145c.

Aquel que importa á su esfera  
Y el pobre jornal que saca?  
Paciendo por él la vaca,  
¿Ha de gastarse en ternera?<sup>28</sup>

This passage is part of a satire on the decadence of Spain, due, Tirso thinks, to increasing luxury and extravagance. It is illuminating because it appears to contradict the proverb on which the passage in the *Don Quijote* is based. Veal is declared to be food for the gentleman, and beef for the laborer. But the contradiction is only apparent. The reference is here to the gentleman who can live according to his rank and not to the poor hidalgo whose standard of living is of necessity little better than that of a peasant.

Beef was also the food of penitents. An interesting allusion is to be found in Tirso's *Marta la piadosa*. The hypocritical Marta put off her silks and donned coarse attire but her affected devotion ceased when it came to eating *vaca*. Like Tartuffe, she secretly regaled herself with good things. Don Gómez observes:

Mientras hay perdiz, no come  
Vaca.<sup>29</sup>

Allusions to *vaca* as the very antithesis of good cheer are common. It is symbolic of the very plainest fare. Cf. Tirso, *La elección por la virtud*:

¡Pobre Laura! ¡que ha podido  
una grosera pastora  
quitarte la posesión,  
que el sayal quieres que tome!  
Mas ¿qué mucho? si hay quien come  
vaca mejor que un capón.<sup>30</sup>

Cf. also Lope de Vega, *El testimonio vengado*:

Señor, como tal vez el faisán cansa,  
Y suele ser la vaca apetitosa,  
Y las mesas espléndidas agradan  
Tanto como extendidas por la yerba,  
Y como agradan los desiertos campos  
Tal vez mejor que cultivados huertos,  
Así es del rey la singular grandeza.  
En estos montes, á mi choza humilde  
Suele venir, cansado de la caza,  
Y por dicha cansado de la corte.<sup>31</sup>

Compare also the refrán: *Mas vale vaca con paz que pollos con agraz*.

<sup>28</sup> P. 633c.

<sup>29</sup> P. 448c.

<sup>30</sup> Cotarelo y Mori, Vol. I, p. 347c.

<sup>31</sup> Academy edition, Vol. VII, p. 605b.



The allusion to *abadejo* in one of the passages quoted above recalls the meal at the inn when Don Quijote partook of this unappetizing salted fish. It was apparently always served soaking in water. Just as *vaca* is one of the most undesirable kinds of meat, so the *abadejo* is the worst possible form of fish. Tirso, Calderón, and Moreto all humorously compare people who have received a ducking to soaking *abadejos*.<sup>32</sup> The reader will recall how Don Quijote was misled by the host's designation of this fish as *truchuela* and fancied himself to be eating trout (*trucha*). Several allusions in Tirso's writings suggest a similar play on words. Cf. *La dama del olivar* :

Deje villanas groseras  
de sayal y de buriel,  
que no es bien coma truchuela  
quien truchas puedo comer.<sup>33</sup>

Cf. also *Tan largo me lo fiáis* :

DON JUAN.

¿Véndese siempre por trucha?

MARQUES.

Ya se da por abadejo.<sup>34</sup>

Don Quijote's encounter with the lion (Part II, Chap. XVII), is commonly thought to have been suggested by certain passages in the romances of chivalry. No very close analogy has been suggested. It is possible, though by no means certain, that Cervantes may be indebted to Bandello for this idea. *Novella xlix of Parte seconda* offers a few parallels. The story is entitled : *Clemenza d'un liono verso una giovanetta, che gli levò un cane fuor degli unghioni, senza ricever nocumento alcuno*. The story has to do with a captive lion which is being conveyed in a cage from Germany to Bohemia. A servant girl carelessly lets her mistress's pet dog enter the lion's cage where the lion captures and holds it without harming it. The servant boldly approaches the lion and rescues the dog without harm to herself. The lion, rendered gentle by captivity, offers not the slightest resistance. The points of similarity are : the

method by which the lion is transported ; the boldness of the servant's approach ; and the meekness of the animal.<sup>35</sup>

GEORGE TYLER NORTHUP.

Princeton University.

### THE SKELETON IN ARMOUR AND THE FRITHIOF SAGA.

During the years 1838-1840 Longfellow's mind was frequently occupied with the thought of writing some ballads or a heroic poem on the discovery of America by the Norsemen. The first mention of the fact is found in a journal entry for May 3, 1838 :—"I have been looking at the old Northern Sagas, and thinking of a series of ballads or a romantic poem on the deeds of the first bold viking who crossed to this western world with storm-spirits and devil-machinery under water."—Early the next year a skeleton was unearthed near Fall River, Mass., clad in broken and corroded armor. Hearing of this,<sup>1</sup> Longfellow went there to see it, when the thought occurred to him "of connecting it with the Round Tower at Newport." Soon after this,<sup>2</sup> he mentions a visit paid him by his friend Felton, and says :—"Told him of my plan of a heroic poem on the Discovery of America by the Northmen, in which the Round Tower at Newport and the Skeleton in Armour have a part to play." A few months later,<sup>3</sup> he speaks of it again. In the meantime<sup>4</sup> he intended to publish another poem on a Scandinavian subject, *Hakon Jarl*, but of this only the title has come down to us. For about a year we hear nothing of his *Skeleton in Armour*, but on December 13, 1840, he writes to his father :—"Have written a translation of a German ballad, and prepared for the press another original ballad, which has been

<sup>35</sup> A similar incident is to be found in Gaspar Mercader's *El prado de Valencia* (ed. Henri Mérimée, Toulouse, 1907), p. 134. The idea of an encounter with a captive lion appears, of course, in the various versions of the knight and the glove story.

<sup>1</sup> Compare the prefatory note to the *Skeleton in Armour* in the volume of *Ballads and Other Poems*, published in Boston, 1842.

<sup>2</sup> May 24, 1839.

<sup>3</sup> December 17, 1839.

<sup>4</sup> Compare his Diary for September 17, 1839.

<sup>32</sup> Tirso, *Huerta de Juan Fernández*, p. 633c ; Calderón, *Lances de amor y fortuna*, Vol. I, p. 43c ; Moreto, *Antioeo y Seleuco*, p. 39a.

<sup>33</sup> Cotarelo y Mori, Vol. II, p. 212b.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 668b.

lying by me for some time. It is called *The Skeleton in Armour*, and is connected with the old Round Tower at Newport. This skeleton really exists. It was dug up near Fall River, where I saw it some two years ago. I suppose it to be the remains of one of the old Northern sea-rovers, who came to this country in the tenth century. Of course I make the tradition myself; and I think I have succeeded in giving the whole a Northern air." One week after this letter was written, he mentions the poem again, admitting that he is "very well satisfied with it" and that he considers it "striking and perhaps unique in conception."

Most of Longfellow's readers are doubtless willing to subscribe to his own words regarding the merits of the poem. One of his biographers<sup>5</sup> even goes so far in his praise of the ballad as to pronounce it "the most purely imaginative, the strongest and the most artistically executed of all his poetic conceptions." But while it may be true that the *Skeleton in Armour* really does excel in vigor and artistic finish, there are ample reasons for questioning whether it should be called a purely imaginative production. The fact that the author mentions the thought of a poem on the discovery of America by the Norsemen as having occurred to him after a perusal of the Norse Sagas, indicates that from the very first he intended to base the ballad on one of them, and hence could have no intention of making it purely imaginative. The additional fact that he referred to it from time to time for more than two years prior to his mention of it in its final form, shows that it was composed only after long and careful deliberation. In the course of these two years he had doubtless made a diligent study of various old Sagas from the North and found that Tegnér's *Frithiof Saga* was the one from which he could best catch the Northern spirit, in order to give the ballad "a Northern air," as he expresses it.

Longfellow's first acquaintance with the writings of Tegnér and other Swedish poets dates from the summer of 1835, when he spent the months of July and August in Sweden. Even at this early date, he says of Tegnér:—"Sweden has one great

poet and only one. That is Tegnér, Bishop of Wexiö, who is still living. His noblest work is 'Frithiof's Saga,' a heroic poem, founded on an old tradition." From that time on, the American poet showed a keen interest in the Swedish language and literature. With reference to a course of lectures which he was to deliver in Harvard college soon after his return to America, he writes to a friend:—"In this course something of the Danish and Swedish (the new feathers in my cap) is to be mingled." Some three months later,<sup>7</sup> he sent a list of twelve lectures to his father, and according to this list two of the twelve were to be on Swedish Literature. Meanwhile he had also announced two articles for the July number of the *North American Review* of that year, "one on the 'Legend of Frithiof,' a Swedish poem."<sup>8</sup>

In this article Longfellow expresses his admiration for Tegnér in the most glowing terms:—"Tegnér stands foremost among the poets of Sweden; a man of grand and gorgeous imagination, and poetic genius of a high order," etc. The *Frithiof Saga* as a whole he pronounces "one of the most remarkable productions of the age," and his comments on the individual cantos are very favorable, for example:—"This canto is conceived and executed in a truly Homeric spirit," or—"The whole ballad is full of grace and poetic beauty." These are only a few of the many remarks which tend to show what profound impressions the *Frithiof Saga* must have made on Longfellow's mind. Whether such impressions later resulted in literary influence<sup>9</sup> may be seen from a comparison of the *Saga* and the *Skeleton in Armour*. In the comparison which follows here, the situations in the *Saga* have been referred to only in so far as some underlying thought in each of them is paralleled by a similar thought in the *Skeleton in Armour*.

In the first canto of the *Frithiof Saga* we are told that even as a young boy Frithiof would rob

<sup>5</sup> G. W. Green, in a letter dated February 1, 1837.

<sup>7</sup> May 12, 1837.

<sup>8</sup> Compare the letter to his father, March 22, 1837.

<sup>9</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the question of influence on Longfellow from Tegnér's writings and other Swedish sources, the writer begs leave to refer to his article, "Is Longfellow's 'Evangeline' a Product of Swedish Influence?" in *Poet Lore*, Vol. xix, No. iii.

<sup>5</sup> F. H. Underwood, *Henry W. Longfellow*, Boston, 1882, page 91.

the *eagle's nest* and carry away its young. In some of the later cantos the *falcon* is frequently mentioned as his most faithful companion.

Compare *Skeleton in Armour* (stanza 4):

"Far in the Northern Land,  
By the wild Baltic's strand,  
I, with my childish hand,  
Tamed the *ger-falcon*."

Canto 18 tells of how King Ring, against the advice of Frithiof, undertakes to drive with his queen over the *thin ice of a lake*. Fired by the heedlessness of the king, Frithiof quickly *puts on his skates* and follows the two in the sled. Very soon the ice begins to break under the royal couple, when Frithiof rushes forward and rescues them.

Compare *Skeleton in Armour* (stanza 4):

"And with my *skates fast-bound*,  
Skimmed the *half-frozen sound*,  
That the poor whimpering hound  
Trembled to walk on."

The *Saga* contains the following short reference to Frithiof's remarkable strength and daring as a huntsman (canto 1—Holcomb's translation):

"Young Frithiof followed oft the chase,  
Which led to many a fearful place;  
With neither spear nor lance defended  
The wild bear's life he quickly ended."

Compare *Skeleton in Armour* (stanza 5):

"Oft to his frozen lair  
Tracked I the grizzly bear."

After Frithiof had been the indirect cause of the burning of Balder's temple, he fled from his country and spent three years of exile in *marauding expeditions*. For these expeditions he framed a *code of laws* which his men were to observe. By one of its decrees they were *ordered* to engage at once the crew of any viking-ship that might be sighted, and every man was *pledged to fight to the last*.

Compare *Skeleton in Armour* (stanza 6):

"But when I older grew,  
Joining a *corsair's crew*,  
O'er the dark sea I flew  
With the *marauders*.  
Wild was the life we led;  
Many the souls that sped;  
Many the hearts that bled  
By our stern orders."

Canto 11 of the *Saga* tells of the royal entertainment accorded to Frithiof at the home of Earl Angantyr. The last stanza of the canto runs as follows (Longfellow's translation):

"Whilst *jest and social joys engage*,  
Swift the *night-watches fled*;  
Freighted with mirth, not fraught with rage,  
The golden *goblet sped*;  
A health to Angantyr they shout,  
At the close of each regale.  
And Frithiof wears the *winter out*,  
Ere swells Ellida's sail."

Compare *Skeleton in Armour* (stanza 7):

"Many a *wassail-bout*  
Wore the long winter out;  
Often our midnight shout  
Set the cocks crowing,  
As we the Berserk's tale  
Measured in cups of ale,  
Draining the oaken pail,  
Filled to o'erflowing."

The seventh canto of the *Frithiof Saga* describes the betrothal of Frithiof and Ingeborg as taking place in the temple of Balder, which was situated in a *grove*, on a clearing called "*Baldershage*." At the time, Ingeborg is *afraid* that they have provoked the wrath of the god by meeting in his temple. But Frithiof dispels her fears by assuring her that Balder, the god of love, can only be pleased to receive as a sacred offering the pure love and fidelity of their hearts. Hereupon the two lovers kneel before the altar and plight their *troth*.

Compare *Skeleton in Armour* (stanza 9):

"I wooed the blue-eyed maid,  
Yielding, yet half afraid,  
And in the forest's shade  
Our vows were plighted."

In the same canto (7) in which the pledge of troth between the lovers is described, Frithiof speaks of the joys that would be his if he and Ingeborg were permitted to go to Valhalla together. As one of the many acts of love which he there would do for her delight he would *build her a bower or cottage by the sea*.

Compare *Skeleton in Armour* (stanza 17):

"There for my lady's bower  
Built I the lofty tower,  
Which, to this very hour,  
Stands looking seaward."

In giving a list of such cases, I mention the page of occurrence of all instances previous to the one commented on, which is in italics at the end of each series. It is a question of mere definition in the case of *biltog* (pp. 59, 5 ; 145, 4 ; 173, 2), *ungersven* (19, 4 ; 91, 3), *till slut* (27 ; 28 ; 33, 4 ; 87, 2v), *id* (56, 2 ; 60), *på en gång* (81, 1 ; 81, 2), *ber om* (45, 1 ; 85, 1 ; 85, 3 ; 120, 2), *hvarst helst* (66, 4 ; 69, 2 ; 138, 5), *på lif och död* (64, 1 ; 103, 3), *i vinter* (92, 3 ; 132, 1), *om julen* (24 ; 128, 1), *om våren* (32, 2) ; cf. *om hösten* (defined p. 86, 2), *det fins* (p. 7, 2 and 3, etc. ; 60). If the student knew the meaning of these expressions the first time, there seems little occasion for defining them later.



P. 154, 5 we are told that *på öppet ting* means "at council in the open air." This the poet himself tells us: "*på öppet ting, ty himlens sky är deras tak.*" But at p. 68 even a good student might well puzzle over the meaning of *öppet* in the same phrase.—P. 96 *ser åt* is defined, though it occurs also p. 67 (twice) and 83, 1. It would seem more apt to refer at p. 123 *visar åt* to note on p. 96, 1 than to p. 69, 2.

The student is referred to a fuller form: *aftonrodnan* (p. 61, 1; 63; 67; 132, 3; 161, 3), *dar* (31, 1; 95), *se'n* (19, 4; 27; 46, 1), *re'n* (48, 4; 51, 1; cf. *alltre'n*, p. 39, 4).—Verb-forms are explained: *finge* (9, 5; 48, 1), *het* (17, 5; 25, 2). We know from p. 10, 1 and 42, 3 and 4 that *qvad* is pret. of *quäda*, and p. 74, 1 we could not interpret it except in the unusual meaning of "call forth by incantation," and yet we are told all this p. 79, 2.—The expression *dag från dag* (10, 3) would naturally offer the same difficulty as *år från år* (explained p. 64). *De* should be omitted in translation p. 124 as well as p. 125, 2 (cf. note to p. 39).

In all these cases the purpose has clearly been to assist the student. In a number of other instances the object may have been historical comment rather than mere help in translation. Such are: *männer* (35, 3; 56, 2; 91, 4), *till* with gen. (28, 2; 43, 3; 69, 2; 114, 1).—The use of *han* and *hon* in place of *den* occurs p. 5, 2; 6, 1; 7, 3; 9, 1; 12, 4 and is explained p. 15.—*Lyster* (76, 3; 86, 2), *bita* (17, 1; 25, 2; 86, 1), *i* in such cases as *i går* (28, 2; 40, 3; 53, 1 and 2; 59, 1; 65, 6).

A thoughtful student would find difficult such forms as *skär* (10, 4), *bär* (12, 4; 50, 3), *hör* (30, 1; 35, 1; 48, 4; 54), *far* (50, 3). The peculiarity is explained in a note to p. 56. The reference at p. 76 to note on p. 56 shows that the editor anticipated difficulty in these cases.—Parallel is the case with verbs whose stem ends in *l*: *stjäl* (62, 4), *täl* (101; 104, 3), *gal* (106), *täl* (161, 1).

The number of belated comments that have come to my notice would make this list probably more than three times as long.

Serious errors are not numerous. The note to p. 6, 3 reads: "*såg*, preterite conjunctive; regular form *såge*." *Såg* is an indicative used in place

of the conjunctive,—a usage fairly common in spoken Swedish. Similar cases occur again p. 6, 3 and 4; 11, 4 and 5; 13, 1; 48, 4; 62; 119, 2. See Beckman, "*Svensk Språklära*," p. 105 and Linder, "*Regler och Råd*," p. 108.

P. 25, "*hvarann*, for metrical reasons shortened from *hvarannan*." A correct statement would be that the shorter (colloquial) form is used for metrical reasons (cf. note to p. 36, 2).

P. 25, "*Het*, abbrev. of *hette*." We would interpret this as meaning that *het* is a (possibly *metri causa*) shortened form of *hette*, which is clearly inaccurate. The shorter form is archaic and dialectical.

P. 51, 1, "*re'n* and *se'n* are the colloquial forms. In the following line the metre required the fuller literary form." This should read: "*Se'n* is colloquial, but *re'n* is a poetical form. In the following line the metre permits the use of the normal (colloquial) form." See *Svenska Akademiens Ordlista*.

P. 59, "*I dag ännu far jag*. Rare use of *ännu* for *redan*. Lit. 'to-day already,' this very day I go." Why interpret it "*ich fahre heute schon*," when it means "*ich fahre heute noch*?"

P. 86, 2, "*lyster*, impers. refl. verb." If it is impersonal, it can not be reflexive.

P. 116, 2, "*snögar*, poetic for *snöar*." Neither form is poetic. See *Svenska Akademiens Ordlista*: "*ifrågavarande stafningsvariant har sin grund i vacklande uttal*."

P. 129, 1, *finger* is said to be a neuter noun. The word is almost everywhere common gender in the pl., and in the South (Götaland) also in the sg. See Freudenthal, "*Östgötalagen*," Hfrs. 1895, p. 94.

The interpretation is, in my opinion, unnecessarily forced in the case of p. 57 *se*, p. 69, 2 *ler*, and p. 124, 1 *sällar*.

I have found a number of numerical misprints in the commentary. The correct form is in each case given in parentheses: p. 11, 3 (11, 4); 18, 1 (18, 3); 10, 2 (19, 2); 29, 2 (omit); 58 *Fafner*, 59 I, 59 *Din* (omit numerals); 116, 1 (116, 2); 118 (118, 1); 120, 1 (120, 2); 127, 6 (127, 5); 135, 5 (135, 6). Numerals should be inserted: p. 11, 5 before *Allfader*; 23 *fäste*; 29, 2 *om ej*; 39, 4 *kungens*; 57 *blef*; 116, 3 *snögar*; 121, 3 *han*; 161, 3 *aftonrodnan*; 161,

4 *hågring*.—P. 24 "note to p. 15, 6" (read 15, 5); p. 33, 4 "line 5" (line 7); p. 35, 3 "note to p. 25, 5" (20, 5).—Other misprints are: p. 33, 4 "prefix" (suffix); p. 131, 5, sentence unfinished; p. 159, 4 *mörkets* (*mörkrets*).—In the text, p. 41 *hängda* should be *hängde*.

A. LOUIS ELMQUIST.

Northwestern University.

### OLD FRENCH.

*An Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology*, by FREDERICK BLISS LUQUIENS. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1909.

This book, as the author informs us in his preface, "is intended not only to introduce beginners to the study of Old French phonology and morphology from the historical point of view, but also to facilitate their progress to an advanced grammar." As a model of such a larger work Professor Luquiens justly considers the well-known *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen* of Schwan-Behrens (7th ed., 1907),<sup>1</sup> and it is to this volume that he refers us as the basis of his *Introduction to Old French*. Let it be said at once, however, that while he has in the main closely adhered to his model both in the arrangement and the theoretical presentation of the matter—an indebtedness for which full acknowledgment is made,—he has by no means followed it slavishly. The independence of his scholarship and judgment is evinced both in the manner in which minor details have been either separated from the more essential matter, or entirely omitted, and in the changes and additions, especially of a pedagogical nature, which have been introduced. Among such changes and additions, the following devices deserve to be mentioned as distinctive and very useful features of his work: 1) An alphabetical list of Phonetic Symbols (pp. 17-19), which is both more complete and more explanatory than the ones offered in the grammars of Schwan-Behrens and others, and all the more helpful as phonetic transcription of words and sounds is more

systematically employed than in similar manuals; 2) three connected passages, with phonetic transcription and commentary, from the *Chanson de Roland*, the *Roman de la Rose*, and *Maistre Pierre Pathelin* (pp. 142-147); 3) a glossary of Technical Terms (pp. 20-22), and 4) a cross-section drawing of the Organs of Speech (p. 23). Such aids as these are unquestionably timely and may be welcomed as a most valuable innovation in the making of elementary historical grammars; but their very timeliness suggests the question whether they should not be accompanied by the explicit statement that a careful training in the classical languages, especially in Latin, in the elements of phonetics and in the correct pronunciation of at least one modern Romance language is the indispensable preparation for a successful study of Romance philology.

The Bibliography and the Alphabetical Index of the volume of Schwan-Behrens have been purposely omitted, the latter on the ground that it might prevent the student from making himself as thoroughly familiar with the elementary grammar as is desirable. Without in the least questioning the wisdom of this view for the purposes of the book before us, we hope that in a second edition the author may feel encouraged to enlarge its scope, adding to a more detailed treatment of the historical development of the language not only a bibliography and a historical index, but a chronological survey of phonetic changes such as the one offered by Meyer-Lübke in his *Historische Grammatik der Französischen Sprache* (Heidelberg, 1908), p. 261, and a list of the most important problems still awaiting solution.

Inasmuch as the phonological and morphological presentation of Old French in the work before us is substantially based upon that of Schwan-Behrens, it is not necessary to enter into anything like a full discussion of the various questions involved. Only a few remarks will be made here in the hope that they may prove of some service to the author in the preparation of a new edition of his grammar.

P. 14, § 10-11 we read: "When this change (*i. e.*, *e > ch*) is more closely examined, it appears: . . . (2) that it took place only during the first Old French period; *i. e.*, that any *e* which had not changed to *ch* by ca. 1100, did not do so

<sup>1</sup>A new, eighth edition (1909) has just appeared.

after that date." This statement does not appear quite correct in the light of what Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des Langues Romanes*, I, § 13; *Einführung*, § 31, has well said with regard to such forms as *chaste*, *chapitre*, Venit. *famega*, etc. Cf. also Suchier in *Miscellanea Ascoli*, p. 69.—P. 15, § 12. In his effort to condense the exposition of the relations between inherited and borrowed words, the author left out of account the fact that Vulgar Latin adopted literary forms which became part of the inherited property of Old French. Cf. e. g., Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung*, § 29.—P. 21. Metathesis results from rapidity of speech rather than from the tendency to ease pronunciation.—P. 27, § 21–28. The passage of VL. *x* before consonants to *s* should have been noted, and § 158, 2 modified accordingly.—P. 34, § 60, note. At least one illustration, e. g., *oc'lu* > *ol'u* > *ueil*, should have been given here.—P. 42, § 108. Read *cippum* for *cippum*; also, *ibid.*, § 113, VL. *p.* for OF. *p.*—P. 63, § 257. Instead of saying that *ai* becomes *êi* during the twelfth century, it would be more exact to say that the two nasal diphthongs were identical in sound and employed in rhyme together since the middle of that century. Cf. Matzke, *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, 21, 637 ff.—P. 70, § 286, 1. *Li rei gonfanoniers*, "the standard-bearer of the king." Westholm (*Étude historique de la construction li fils le rei*, 1899) has shown that in such possessive expressions the accusative-form *rei* performs the function of a dative rather than as a genitive, as it is still commonly assumed, and it is desirable that the student's attention be called to this fact.—P. 99, § 342. "The second *d* of the VL. ending *-dēdi* disappeared by a process called 'dissimilation'; then *-êi* became *-i* by 50." No other explanation is needed for the loss of *d* than in other cases where it is intervocalic. Cf. § 116. Why not explain this case by the rule stated for intervocalic *d* in § 116?—P. 91, § 337, b. It were better, especially in scientific grammars, to discard the term "conditional" for the verbal form expressing a conclusion from a condition, replacing it by some more accurate designation of what is really a *futurum in praeterito*.—P. 129, § 396. The etymon of *ocidre* is *aucidere* (cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung*, p. 143), and not *occidere*, which would have given *oicidre*.—P.

134, § 409. *Conoistre*, not from *conoscere*, but from *conoscere* (cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung*, p. 33), also postulated by Ital. *conoscere*, Span. *conocer*.

Besides these, there are other cases in which the doctrine of Schwan-Behrens may well be revised in accordance with more recent investigation such as Meyer-Lübke's *Einführung*, the second edition of which has just appeared, and the same author's *Historische Grammatik der französischen Sprache*. Such cases are, e. g., the development of words like *sapidus*, *nitidus*, *malehabitus* (p. 44, § 122, 2), of *sk* to *s* (§§ 136 and 147).

Apart from minor points such as the ones above mentioned, in regard to which one may hold different opinions, Professor Luquiens' book is worthy of all praise, and deserves to be welcomed not only as the first Old French grammar offered by an American to the English-speaking public, but as well fitted to fulfill the purposes for which it is intended.

H. R. LANG.

Yale University.

LOUISE DELPIT: *L'âge d'or de la littérature française*. D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, 1909.

This book, although not a work of science, deserves a brief mention here. It will advantageously replace the Duval, upon which many schools, and even colleges, have so long depended for an elementary course in French literature. Miss Delpit has a real sense of what young people ought to be told, what will make literature interesting to them and not distasteful. She also realizes very well that a history of French literature for American schools must be written in an entirely different spirit from such a history written for French schools. Many things that can easily be taken for granted in a French milieu require careful explanation for students in a foreign country.

Does this mean that Miss Delpit's book is ideal from all points of view?—No. I can imagine a book rendered even more objective than hers. There are a few chapters where the author has forgotten what she had so well realized in others, namely, that it is best to start on the principle



that the American child studying her book knows absolutely nothing about French literature, and even about French history. The first chapter presupposes a great many things which surely are ignored (why not drop the chapter altogether?); the chapter on Boileau suggests to me the same criticism. Here and there, I should like to cut down passages either of praise or of criticism of the authors treated: those of praise because in a work like that praise cannot be but commonplace, those of adverse criticism because pupils have so strong an inclination for criticism anyway that it is an undesirable system to encourage in them the disposition of finding fault with great men.<sup>1</sup> I have in mind especially the chapters on Calvin, Montaigne, La Fontaine.

Miss Delpit is right to avoid any show of erudition. Still I am not sure whether at some places, even in such a book, some note was not called for. The recent discussions about Pascal and Descartes might have been ignored; but just one word regarding the Montaigne-La Boétie controversy would not be superfluous, as it throws new and for us unsuspected light on Montaigne. I feel all the more inclined to say this because elsewhere Miss Delpit has rather insisted on the inauthenticity of the fifth book of Pantagruel.

Occasionally one might desire a somewhat broader view of things. The work of Montaigne is too exclusively presented as that of an irreducible egoist; this is doing injustice both to Montaigne himself, and to posterity which has agreed to see in him one of the finest specimens of humanity.<sup>2</sup> Malherbe is given us as the man who has "par malheur, réussi à décourager, pour près de deux cents ans, la poésie lyrique" (p. 71). No! One man has no such power. There are much deeper causes which explain the lack of lyric poetry during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in France—and I suspect Miss Delpit knows it, too.

The weakest point in Miss Delpit's book are the notes, put at the bottom of pages. It is difficult to find what criterion the author has adopted to

decide where to put notes and where not to put any. Page 9, she explains that modern syntax would not allow *le vous décrire*, but would require *vous le décrire*, and four lines above she says nothing of the archaism of *ressembler* with accusative. Page 32, she explains who *Renée de Ferrare* is, but not who *Guillaume Farel* is; page 17, she does not explain the word *buveries*, used by Rabelais; nor on page 20, *les sept arts libéraux*. On page 8 the two following lines of Marot are quoted:

*Jamais je n'entre en Paradis  
S'ils (les régents) ne m'ont perdu ma jeunesse,*

which are by no means easy to understand. They mean, 'May I never enter Paradise, if it is not true that my teachers have caused me to waste my youth,'—but surely I would not ask young pupils to find out without help.

Often Miss Delpit's own French would need annotation. She writes remarkably well, she has freshness of style, life, picturesque expressions. It is a really esthetic pleasure to read her book; so much so that I do not hesitate to say that her book might be used to great advantage as a regular textbook for translation. Pupils would get very profitable information, which is by no means the case with so many silly stories read in our classes. But in textbooks such expressions like *famélique gibier de potence* (p. 3), *niais et ignorant à souhait* (p. 17), *assommé force mécréants* (p. 19), *Panurge aussitôt de croquer sa fortune à belles dents* (p. 22), etc., would be explained. Why not here?

To summarize: except for a few things of minor importance and which can be corrected in later editions, this is a very able book, warmly to be recommended either as a *History of French Literature*, or as a regular textbook for reading.

A. SCHINZ.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

<sup>1</sup> I realize, however, that this is not the general attitude of instructors; many believe that criticism and literature are synonyms.

<sup>2</sup> I would recommend to Miss Delpit the recent article by Henri Monod, in the "Revue de Paris" (Mars 1910), *Montaigne après la Saint Barthelemy*.

GOETHE'S GESPRÄCHE. Gesamtausgabe. Neu herausgegeben von FLODOARD FRHR. VON BIEDERMANN, unter Mitwirkung von MAX MORRIS, HANS GERHARD GRÄF und LEONHARD L. MACKALL. Erster Band. Von der Kindheit

bis zum Erfurter Kongress, 1754 bis Oktober 1808. Zweiter Band. Vom Erfurter Kongress bis zum letzten böhmischen Aufenthalt, 1808 November bis September 1823. Leipzig: F. W. v. Biedermann, 1909. Imported by The Bruno Hessling Company, New York.

In these days of a revised Hempel edition of Goethe, a revised *Der junge Goethe*, a revised Eckermann, various revised correspondences with Goethe, to say nothing of the many new editions of Goethe's works, a revised and greatly enlarged edition of the *Gespräche* was naturally to be expected and now that the first two volumes have appeared we may for once congratulate ourselves on the fact that revision and enlargement seem to pervade the atmosphere of recent German literature.

Woldemar von Biedermann was the first scholar to conceive and carry out the plan of a complete edition of Goethe's conversations so far as they had been recorded and printed (*Goethes Gespräche*, 10 vols., Leipzig, Biedermann, 1889-1896). It was by no means a slight task to gather the material from its widely scattered sources, and hence not to be wondered at that reviewers found some oversights and imperfections to criticise. But the idea met with cordial approval and the collection, in spite of its few shortcomings, was immediately accorded a place among the standard works of reference on Goethe.

It was Biedermann's hope that the work might experience a revised edition, which would make it possible for him to fill in gaps, correct errors, and supplement the contents to conform to his plan as it developed in his mind after the early volumes of the set had been sent out into the world. When the time came for a second edition he was no longer among the living. But the results of his later work were preserved and transmitted to his son, Flodoard von Biedermann, who is now finishing the editorial task, with the assistance of Morris, Gräf, and Mackall, beside a large number of other scholars who have called attention to out-of-the-way material not likely to come to the notice of every scholar or every group of scholars.

The scope of the collection has been enlarged to include the recorded impressions derived from direct personal contact with Goethe. This might

have called for a revision of the title, as the introduction suggests, but the old title is too well established and too convenient for citation to warrant a change. Instead of adhering closely, as might be expected, to the chronological order, so far as that would be possible, the editor follows this order in the main, deviating from it slightly to the end that the material may be so disposed as to create a more or less harmonious impression and afford interesting consecutive reading. The *Briefe* give us a somewhat connected picture of Goethe's life and thought, but the *Gespräche* give us an even more vivid impression of him, in fact the difference is almost greater than that between any two portraits of his physical personality. The utterances of contemporaries concerning him serve materially to complete the picture, giving it a stereoscopic effect, so to speak, and no more suitable combination could have been found in which to publish them. Such conversations and impressions as might, in the editor's opinion, detract from the pleasure of consecutive reading, and would interest only specialists, are reserved for the final volume, which is to contain sources, commentary, and index.

The first edition was in ten volumes, the second is to be in five, notwithstanding the fact that there is now to be double the number of items in the compilation. The page of the new edition is a little longer and wider, the text is set considerably closer, and great economy has been exercised with the space between numbers. And yet the page is agreeable to the eye. The German type has been replaced by Latin, and the volumes are well printed and substantially bound. The price of the new edition is less than half of that of the first. This puts the work within the reach of all who need to own it, and von Biedermann deserves our thanks for taking the selling price into consideration, especially as we are now in the midst of such a deluge of new Goethe literature.

The widening of the scope of the compilation increases proportionately the liability to overlook some material. But the names on the title-page are sufficient guarantee that everything of importance will be included. In fact, the editors are more likely to hear the criticism that they have included too much rather than that they have omitted anything, and yet in such collections as this the first aim should be completeness, since

small items, in themselves seemingly insignificant, often take on significance when incorporated in such a large body of related material. If for no other reason, they help to lend atmosphere and perspective to the whole picture. The volumes thus far published leave us with the feeling that we have witnessed the real Goethe in direct personal contact with his fellow men, and the value of such records cannot be overestimated. The five volumes will form a necessary supplement to the hundred thirty some volumes of the Weimar Goethe and may confidently be expected soon to find their way into all working Goethe libraries. Because of the material that has come to light since the first edition was published, and of the opportunity to correct former errors, supply omissions, and enlarge its scope, the new edition will be found more reliable than the old, and will more adequately serve the purpose that the elder Biedermann had in mind when he first undertook the gigantic task.

W. A. COOPER.

Stanford University.

ROTH, RICHARD: *Ein Nordischer Held*. Edited with Introduction, Notes, Exercises, and Vocabulary by HELENE H. BOLL. New York, etc.: American Book Company, 1910. 16mo., 175 pp., cloth, 35 cents.

Teachers of German who tire of fairy tales and "insipid love stories" for second and third year reading will welcome the appearance of this little text. They owe a real debt of gratitude to Miss Boll for making it so serviceable for class room use.

*Ein Nordischer Held* is a historical narrative, intensely interesting and "well calculated to inspire the youth of America to follow as noble an example as history records of love for native country." It deals with the adversities—captivity, flight, sufferings from treachery and persecution—and the pluck, perseverance, miraculous rescues and final triumphs of Gustavus Vasa, the "George Washington of the North," who wrested his country from the tyrannical rule of the most cruel despot of his times, Christian II of Denmark. The pivotal point of the story is the "Stockholm Massacre" (1520), an event of such gruesome horror as to cause one to be vividly reminded of the massacre of the Huguenots in Paris under the regency of Catherine de Medici.

The general plan of the editorial work is comparatively free from all objectionable features. The notes are succinct but clear and are calculated

to aid the pupil rather than to display the knowledge of the editor. The appended exercises for composition and conversation (four pages of English and ten of German) are based on the text; they are well graded and very sensible. And the vocabulary, while complete, is not burdened with an unnecessarily large number of definitions.

Unfortunately, the otherwise so delightful little book presents a rather large proportion of typographical errors and editorial inaccuracies. Of these the following have been noted: p. 7, l. 1, "the 13th century" for "the 14th century"; p. 9, l. 10, "Engelbrektsen" for "Engelbrektsen"; p. 11, ll. 9-10, "schweifte der Blicke" for "schweifte der Blick" or "schweiften die Blicke"; p. 13, l. 15, "fruchtbaren" for "fruchtbarem" and "wohlgeeigneten" for "wohlgeeignetem"; p. 14, footnote to l. 13, "The Union lasted only until the birth of Margaret in 1411" for "The Union lasted only until the death of Margaret (she was born in 1353), etc."; p. 15, l. 8, the construction calls for a comma after "II"; p. 84, l. 13, "denn" for "den." In the vocabulary occur the forms "Argernis" for "Argernis," "biderben" for "biderb(e)," "Upsalier" for "Upsalaer" (cf. p. 54, l. 7); and the weak verb "drängen" is given, "drängen (drang, gedrungen)."

The most serious defect of the vocabulary as a whole is its lack of uniformity in accentuation. Thus, "Anblick, Ankunft, Eroberung, Gestalt, Hinblick, Knabe, etc.," have the accent indicated, while "Autorität, Charakter, Familie, Katechismus, Kommandant, Soldat," and other words of foreign origin are given without accent. A similar absence of uniformity is noticeable in the designation of the initial case endings of pronominal adjectives, thus: "all, -er, -e, -es"; but "diese, -r, -s"; and again, "jed-er, -e, -es" and "jen-er, -e, -es."

Attention is directed also to certain important omissions in the vocabulary, for example: (1) the words "indem" (p. 22, l. 2) and "rege" (p. 22, l. 21) omitted entirely, and the word "übel" (p. 19, l. 25) given only under "wohl"; (2) no indication of case or cases governed by the prepositions "an, bei, in," and only the dative case designated for the prepositions "hinter, neben, vor"; (3) no indication of weak singular forms for the noun "Bauer," although such forms occur in the text (p. 64, l. 11 and p. 66, l. 19); (4) no mention of a neuter gender (as in the text, p. 15, l. 25) for the noun "Begehr"; (5) no mention of case constructions with the verbs "beiwohnen, danken, entgegen, entrinnen, sich erinnern, folgen, gedenken, gefallen, gehorchen, helfen, trauen."

The following constructions call for editorial comment: p. 22, l. 8, "sich Glück zu wün-



schen," 'to congratulate himself'; p. 31, l. 13, "nichts weniger als," 'anything but, far from'; p. 51, l. 3, "ergingen sie sich," 'they indulged'; p. 86, l. 20, "und" = "wenn auch." The note on the gerundive construction, p. 57, l. 26, should have been made to refer to the first occurrence of this construction, p. 27, l. 16, and for a like reason the reference to "im Schilde führen," p. 37, l. 24, properly belongs to p. 35, l. 9. In the latter instance, the recurrence of the phrase (p. 52, l. 10) might also have been pointed out.

EDWARD THORSTENBERG.

Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University.

### TEXTUAL NOTES.

- I. PORTER'S *Two Angry Women of Abington*, edited by C. M. GAYLEY, in *Representative English Comedies*. New York, 1903.

Professor Gayley's text professes to be a faithful reprint of the 2d quarto of 1599 ( $Q_2$ ), except as indicated in the footnotes. Thru the kindness of Mr. W. A. White, I have been enabled to collate his copy of  $Q_2$  with G.'s text. The two differ frequently. Indeed, on only 5 pages of the 97 occupied by this play do I find no divergencies. Whether these divergencies are variants between copies of the same edition, or whether G. has been peculiarly unhappy in a persistent inaccuracy, of course I cannot say, without access to his original, Bodleian Malone 184. It is but fair to say that the variations rarely affect the meaning.

I cite (by page and line) a few representative variants. (1) 542. 26 G. reads *compass* for *compasse*, 542. 34 *kindness* for *kindnes*, 543. 51 (*et passim*) *do* for *doe*, 627. 125 *tell* for *tel*. These suggest that G. took a modernized printed text as a basis, and, as was inevitable, failed to revise it perfectly; but what of 551. 69 *chanel*s for *chanels*, 633. 315 *doone* for *done*, 539. 13 *hee* for *he*? Both these sorts can be produced *ad libitum*. (2) In nine places (I count hastily) G. inserts without remark words not in  $Q_2$ , as 612. 189 *you*, 625. 56 *lucke*, 626. 84 *I say*. He misreads, 554. 176 *of* for *in*, 556. 230 *is* for *in*, 615. 270 *him* for *them*, 620. 33 *thy* for *my*, *et al.* (3) In 13 places (again I count hastily) G.'s footnote assigns a wrong variant to  $Q_2$ , e. g., 614. 266 where G. has *swones* in text and says  $Q_2$  reads *swoses*; in fact,  $Q_2$  has *swounes*. (4) G. frequently, without comment, alters the original arrangement of words in the line. At one place (p. 570) he supplies in brackets a stage-direction which is in  $Q_2$ . Incidentally one might inquire whether it is not an

affectation to supply stage-directions in Elizabethan English, as is done in this edition. (5) G. supplies, 606. 102 *off*, where Dyce supplies *question*; but the sense is complete without either, and one is hardly justified in supplying a word solely for metrical regularity.

I append a brief description of Mr. White's copy of  $Q_2$ . A-K in fours (J omitted), no pagination. (A) title-page; verso 'The names of the speakers' and 'The prologue.' A<sub>2</sub>-K<sub>4</sub> (verso) text of the play. The book contains 40 leaves exclusive of fly-leaves. It is in a modern binding of red morocco.

- II. DEKKER'S *Old Fortunatus*, edited by H. SCHERER in *Münchener Beiträge*, Heft 21, Leipzig, 1901.

Dr. Scherer undertakes to give us an accurate reprint of the quarto of 1600. Again I am indebted to Mr. White for the means of testing the accuracy of the reprint. I have compared the prologs (89 lines), lines 1-102, 323-358, and 2157-2260. No errors appear beyond a few misprints such as *Longavylle* for *Longavile* (2207), and a few slips in the punctuation (in which S. undertakes to note every change from the quarto), e. g., 42 where quarto reads *rarely*, *marrie*—similar slip in 24, 25, and 27. Periods are silently inserted after the numbers 1 and 2, denoting the speakers in the prolog at court. The title-page, in the original set in lower case with an occasional initial capital, is put in capitals thruout, betraying Dr. S. into printing SERVANTS where the usage of the time would have called for SERVANTS. Further the existence of the vignette on the title-page is noted, but the motto 'aut nunc aut nunquam' is not noted. The lining of the title-page is also disturbed for no cause. I speak of these very minor details to emphasize the need of fidelity even to the remotest detail; for S. aims to enable us to work without the original and he must therefore have our confidence to the last comma. In collating the texts of Dilke 1816 and Rhys 1887, S. does not note their alterations in stage-directions or Rhys's divisions into acts and scenes. Such omission of modern changes is not without justification, but the fact is that S. seems not to have realized fully that title-page, stage-directions, and dramatis personae are integral parts of the play for scholarly purposes—especially for the study of the theater itself—and should receive the same faithful attention that he has given to the body of the text.

CHARLES M. HATHAWAY, JR.

U. S. Naval Academy.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## "THE FOOLISH EIESSE."

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—"The foolish Eiesse, which will never away" is a curious specimen among the creatures to which Euphues likens Philautus and "all fond lovers" (*Complete Works of John Lyly*, ed. by R. Warwick Bond, Clarendon Press, 1, 249). The point of the implied warning has been rather obscured by the mystery concerning the animal. Mr. Bond in his note on the passage (p. 348) suggests Pettie's *Pallace*, fol. 82, as a possible parallel: "knowe him to be a Niesse, which wyl neuer away." Mr. Bond continues, "(This is) perhaps for *niece* = relative, or connected, like 'nuisance,' with *nuire*, or perhaps error for 'an Eiesse,' which baffles me." The form "Giesse" appears in the Arber reprint (p. 109) and in Dr. Friedrich Landmann's edition of part of *Euphues*, the *Anatomy of Wit* (in *Englische Sprach- und Literaturdenkmale*, No. 4, 1887, p. 81). It may be granted that "Giesse" (= geese) has a certain appropriateness. But this seems to have been an emendation. For Mr. Bond's collation of the earlier copies indicates "Eiesse" for all editions previous to 1617, when the evident corruption "Elesse" crept in. I have been able to consult only the edition of 1580 for this point; the form there is clearly "Eiesse."

As for the meaning of "Eiesse," we appear to have a case in which the commentator has stopped in his baffling search when the solution has been almost in his grasp. For I am strongly inclined to believe that Mr. Bond has given the clue to the animal's identity in the passage from Pettie and in his suggestion "an Eiesse." A little experimentation with *Eiesse* and *Niesse* reminds one of the double forms *Eyas* and *Nyas*, and, of course, readily recalls the "aery of children, little eyases." Moreover, since the letter *N* has appeared in the *Oxford Dictionary*, we find our authority: for this quotes the Pettie passage itself under *Nyas* (forms, *nyesse*, *niesse*, etc.). Under *Eyas* the *Oxford Dictionary* gives the variants *eyes*, *yas*, *eyess(e)*, *eyasse*, *eyeass*, and *iaes*, but not *eiesse*; nor do the quotations include the passage from *Euphues*. It would seem, however, that the editors might properly have inserted both the form and the example from Lyly in the *Dictionary*. The meaning given for *Eyas* is "a young hawk taken from the nest for the purpose of training, or one whose training is incomplete"; and with this meaning the warning of Euphues—"Wilt thou resemble the kinde Spaniell, which the more he is beaten the fonder he is, or the foolish Eiesse, which will neuer

away?"—becomes, rhetorically at least, effectively definite.

W. HARRY CLEMONS.

Princeton University Library.

## A NOTE ON HERRICK.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Herrick's "Cherry-Ripe" is apparently based upon Campion's "There's a garden in her face." Campion compares the lips of his mistress to ripe cherries; Herrick does the same: "There where Julia's lips do smile." The later poem has no refrain, yet its "Cherry-ripe, ripe, ripe, I cry," practically corresponds with Campion's "Till 'Cherry-ripe' themselves do cry." Campion uses the conceit of comparing his mistress's face to a garden. Exactly the same thing is done by Herrick, but less directly.

Campion carries the idea of his poem farther than Herrick does that of his; in fact, the latter seems to have used only the first two stanzas of the old song. Its twelve verses have been condensed into eight; but, notwithstanding this fact, all the essential elements remain.

R. S. FORSYTHE.

University of Kansas.

## AN EDITOR'S CORRECTIONS.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—I beg leave to point out a few cases where the vocabulary in my recent edition of Selma Lagerlöf's *En Herrgårdssägen* does not correspond with the text. Selma Lagerlöf has herself read the proof to the text as it here stands, and in doing so, has made several changes from the older edition that I had to use. "Säterflicka" has been changed to "fäbodflicka" (p. 119) and to "fäbodjanta" (p. 123). The omission of "lag" (p. 47), is also due to revision.

The spelling of "för den skull," "fichu," "spetsfichu," have been altered to "förden-skull," "fischy," "spetsfischy." In a conversation with Selma Lagerlöf last summer, I pointed out to her that "trädhård" (p. 27) is an erroneous form, and should be written "trähård." This correction Miss Lagerlöf intended to make in the new edition (as I have made it in the vocabulary).

Besides this, I have noticed the following omissions: "bön," "fäbod," "kapitel," "trast," "vis." The words "suck," "sucka," "suttit," "undfly" appear in the wrong place.

A. LOUIS ELMQUIST.

Northwestern University.